

A 1490 p. 95. 7.

PRESERVATIVE AGAINST PRESBYTERY.

Hebrews v. 4.

*No man taketh this Honour unto himself, but he that is
called of GOD, as was Aaron.*

Ezekiel xxxiii. 11, 12, 13.

*Say unto them, As I live, saith the LORD GOD, I
have no pleasure in the death of a Sinner, &c.*

St. Luke xi. 2.

When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in Heaven, &c.

St. James ii. 25.

*Ye see then how that by Works a man is justified, and
not by Faith only.*

Romans xiv. 15.

Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom CHRIST died.

Nehemiah vii. 64.

*These sought their Register among those that were reckon-
ed by genealogy, but it was not found: therefore were
they, as polluted, put from the Priesthood.*

St. Jude ii.

— And perished in the gainsaying of Core,

Printed in the Year MDCCXLVIII.





A

Preservative,

&c.

I *St. John iv. 1. Dearly beloved, believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they are of GOD.*

NEVER was a time, my dear brethren, in which this direction of the holy Apostle was more expedient, than what the present time is; never more need for Christians being on their guard against the craftiness of *Seducers*, against the temptations of deceiving Spirits, than what there is now. The present gloomy situation of that part of the *Catholick Church* which is in this kingdom calls loudly upon the faithful members of it, to be very jealous and watchful, lest our busy enemies get any advantage over us; or by their repeated arguments should shake our constancy and resolution.

In every age, and in every nation, there have false Prophets gone out into the world: this is what our blessed LORD and his *Apostles* after him have forewarn'd us of. But we are come to these unhappy days, when false Prophets are not only winked at, but are countenanced, foster-
ed

ed and encouraged, are seconded with power and with the sanction of Laws, to strengthen and corroborate their erroneous doctrines: These are the men called *Presbyterians*, that upstart sett of people, who were never heard of till about two hundred years ago; but ever since that time, have been the constant plague, and sometimes the ruin, of both *Church* and *State* in this nation.

'Tis true, for some time past, they (the *Presbyterians*) had affected a shew of great moderation, which we were willing to believe real, and that it proceeded from a spirit of christian meekness, or at least, was the result of the justest policy. The old fiery *Enthusiasts*, who had carried things so high at the *Revolution*, were now almost worn out, and their Successors, of modern education, appeared to be of a very different stamp; the prevailing doctrines in Philosophy and Religion had been generally espoused by them also, and both in their Sermons and conversations they zealously recommended universal benevolence, humanity and the moral obligations, freedom of thought, charity for all who differed from them, and the harmlessness of opinions, provided the professors of them were sincere: such, I say, were the avowed principles of many, the most eminent, of their new Divines; and none seemed greater enemies to persecution than they: as indeed it would have been contrary both to their interest and honour. This fair outside procur'd them great applause, and now that they were secure from danger and firmly seated in the Establishment, it might have raised an odium against them, which could not have been easily warded off, and whose consequences it was impossible for them to know, if they had proceeded with their wonted cruelty against a sett of men for adhering to principles, their sincerity in which behoved to appear evident to the whole world, as they retained them maugre almost every imaginable discouragement: they judged it therefore more agreeable to their present circumstances, to proceed with that cunning which is so natural to them, than with severity; and accordingly set themselves to cajole our people, and insinuate into their favour, and by degrees, under specious pretences of the little difference betwixt our way and theirs, and their freedom to go lengths with us which we could

not



not do with them, took occasion to brand us as rigid and uncharitable ; and thereby to alienate the minds of the weaker sort, and seduce them, first with some reluctance to countenance, and (as there is a progress in Error as well as in Vice) at last throughly to embark in the *Schism*, to the great hazard of their salvation. But Time, the mother of Truth, has discovered the cheat, and laid open the inconsistency and dissimulation of the *Party* : For their barbarous and inhumane conduct of late has now made it clear, that the quiet we formerly enjoy'd, was owing to the lenity of the *Administration*, that would not hearken to their cruel suggestions ; tho, to serve a turn, they would willingly have assumed the merit of it, and palmed themselves upon the world for meek and harmless lambs, without malice and without guile : But, when they had another game to play, they laid aside the vizor, and let the ravening *Wolf* appear in his genuine form. As none are truer to themselves, or can improve opportunities better, they no sooner found a *Ministry* for their purpose and, by restless solicitations, holding forth their own *Consequence*, and the merit of their late behaviour, had gained so much influence, as to make them the executioners of their rage and spite against the *Church*, than the antient persecuting spirit returned.

And now, after a considerable tract of calmness and quiet, they are beginning again to rouse themselves, and with all their might, with threatnings and fawning speeches, with force and fraud by turns, they are endeavouring to subvert that distressed part of the *Catholick Church* in this kingdom, which has always been an eye-sore to them ; and has, before this time, felt the fury of their malicious power : and, to the great grief of all sincere christians, many there are, that were once of our number, but have basely forsaken us in our calamity, that have deserted a suffering religion, and preferred a prospering and flourishing *Schism*, before the communion of a Church in distress.

Now, in these dangerous and deceitful times, in which so many are leaving their first loves, and dropping off from the faith once delivered to them, I thought it my duty to endeavour, all that lay in my weak power, to preserve you from falling away ; and to retain you steadfast and unmove-
able

able in the profession of these christian principles, which hitherto you have so zealously espoused.

Time was, when I could have said something of this nature before you all assembled in publick ; but now, that our sacred places are demolished, and the ill-natur'd zeal of our godly neighbours, among whom we live, has taken from us the agreeable opportunity of such Assemblies, I must content my self with writing to you, thereby to fix and confirm some of you in that dejected *Faith*, which others of you are already begun to be ashamed of: And however plausible arguments may be offered to you by these triumphing *Presbyterians*, however strenuously their *Teachers*, or leading men may go about to wheedle you into their *Party*, I beseech you, my brethren, hearken not unto them; neither be shaken by their false suggestions. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they are of GOD.*

In pursuance of this design, all that is necessary will be to represent to you, in a true light, what kind of spirit these *Presbyterians* are of, by comparing their whole Constitution with the Constitution of our *Church*; and, when their tricks and corruptions are thus exposed to open view, I persuade my self, that neither you nor any reasonable Christian will believe them.

To this purpose I shall,

- I Shew you their Original, which will be no great Task to do.
- II. Consider their *Constitution*, in all it's several parts, of *Government*, *Doctrine* and *Worship*.
- III. Shall answer all the particular arguments and motives which they propose to you, at this time, to seduce you over to them; and confute these few excuses which our proselited members have to say in their own defence: and I shall take care to advance nothing but upon undeniable proofs, nor to charge our enemies with any Error which I shall not make out.

§ I.

In the first place then, let us trace back these *Presbyterian* Neighbours of ours to their original; and, if the Gospel observation be true, *That an evil tree cannot bring forth good*

good fruit, nor a corrupt fountain send forth pure streams, then we have little good to say of the *Presbyterians*, notwithstanding of all their mighty boasts and strong presumptions in their own favour. Their *Party* first began in *RE-BELLION*, and that too in a double shape: They first threw off their obedience to their spiritual Superiors, the *Rulers* and *Governors* of *Christ's Church*, and, to aggravate the crime, they next took up arms of defiance against their temporal Sovereign: Will any man say that these Spirits are of God? If you think this too severe a charge, I appeal to themselves: I assure you, they are so far from denying it, that they glory in it; and whenever opportunity offered, they were ready to imitate the example of their *Forefathers*. Nay, so very confident are they in what their Ancestors did, that they assume the whole praise of the *Reformation* to themselves, and talk very haughtily, "*That this Nation was reformed from Popery by Presbytery*:" This they fancy is a great deal, as indeed it would be something for them, if it were literally true, and this they take care to throw in ignorant people's teeth, to gain a vogue for their *Party* and to blind the eyes of such as wish well to the *Reformation*, and hate the superstitious abuses of the Church of *Rome*. But to this Assertion these two things may be answered,

First, It is not true, that this Nation was reformed by men of the present *Presbyterian* principles; which will sufficiently appear, if we consider the history of those Times.

It was about the middle of the sixteenth Century, that King *Henry* the VIII. of *England* threw off the burdensome yoke of the *Pope's* Supremacy and made a shew of introducing a *Reformation* of Religion in his Kingdom: but all his lifetime little more was done that way, than what served to advance some greedy views of that avaricious *Prince*

This King *Henry* was Uncle by the Mother side to our K. *James* the V. whom he took pains to instruct in some of his *Reformation* principles; and, to this purpose, he appointed a conference with him at *York*, to settle some points in debate between them. But our King was influenced by *popish* Counsellors, who were afraid of the consequences of such a meeting; and so great weight had their remonstrances

tes with him, that he declared war against his Uncle: but so little to the nation's satisfaction, and to his own advantage, that the very grief of the thing killed him.

IT was in the year 1542. that K. *James* the V. died; and, upon his death, great commotions happened in the kingdom. Cardinal *Beton* endeavoured to establish the Government to himself during the minority of Q. *Mary*, the only Child that K. *James* left: But, contrary to his Faction, the E. of *Arran* was appointed Governor by the *States* of the *Realm*. This Earl, at that time, favoured the newly appearing *Protestant* Party, and had two Chaplains, *Guillam* and *Rough*, that preached and prayed, and celebrated the other parts of divine worship in his family. But things did not continue long in this way. The Governor fell back to *Popery*, and his Chaplains were banished into *England*. The Q. Dowager, *Mary* of *Lorain*, was constituted Regent of the Kingdom, and, by her management, gave many rubbs to the *Reformation*.

'Tis true, there was a great spirit in the Kingdom against *Popery*, and this spirit was inflamed and countenanced by the *Nobility*, that longed to be handling the rich *Church-livings*: And these carried on their designs so closely and constantly, that at last they gained their point, and got, what they called, a *Reformation* wrought. But I cannot see what ground the *Presbyterians* have for saying, 'That the Nation was reformed by them:' If they mean by themselves, men of a *Church-devouring* principle, we must own, the *Reformation* was principally carried on by them: But to say, That the Nation was reformed by *Presbytery*, is a thing which, I acknowledge, I cannot understand. The history of those times speak in another strain.

Mr. *Patrick Hamilton*, one of the first that can be called *Reformers*, who was burnt in 1527, was vested with *prelatical* dignity: for he was Abbot of *Fearn*: Sure no man will say, he was a *Presbyterian*. What Mr. *George Wishart* was, whether in *Orders* or not, is not altogether certain: But, even according to the confession of the renowned *John Knox* himself, there were *Prelates* that had a hand in the *Reformation*.

In the Parliament 1560, that met by commission from
Q. *Mary*

Q. Mary, then in *France*, on purpose to settle some points of *Reformation*, he says, “ *The chief pillars of the papistical Church gave their presence; such as the Bishops of St. Andrews, Dumblain and Dunkeld, with others of the inferior sort, besides these that had renounced Papistry, and openly profest JESUS CHRIST with us; such as the Bishop of Galloway, the Abbots of Lindoris, Culrofs, St. Colm’s Inch, New-bottle, Holy-rood-house; the Priors of St. Andrews, Coldinghame, St. Mary’s Isle; the Sub-prior of St. Andrews, and divers others, whom we observed not.* ”

In this Parliament, where these *Prelates* sat, a *Confession of Faith* was given in and ratified, in several points differing from the present *Presbyterian Confession of Faith*, and two Acts were passed, the one against the *Mass*, and the sayers and hearers thereof; the other for abolishing the *Pope’s* usurped authority in *Scotland*. These Acts, says *Knox’s History*, were read in Parliament, and ratified by the three *Estates* of the *Realm*, at *Edinburgh*, the 17th day of *July*, in the year of our *L O R D* 1560. And the first *Book of Discipline*, which was compiled by order of this Parliament, is attested by the Subscriptions of *Mr. Alexander Gordon* Bishop of *Galloway*, *Alexander Campbel* Dean of *Murray*, with a great number more of the *Clergy*: And in the Subscription is this proviso “ *Providing, that the Bishops, Abbots, Priors and other Prelates and beneficed men, which else have adjoined themselves unto us, brook the Revenues of their Benefices during their lifetimes; they sustaining and upholding the Ministry and Ministers, as is herein specified, for preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments.* ” Besides these, there were a great many *Lay-men* that mightily forwarded this work; Even in the year 1558, (says *Knox*) we had no publick *Ministers* of the *Word*: Only certain zealous men exhorted their brethren. And he mentions the *Laird of Dun*, *David Forres*, *Mr. Robert Lockhart*, *Mr. Robert Hamilton*, *William Harlaw*, *Paul Methven* and others. And such was the scarcity of *Ministers*, that, after the *Pacification* at *Leith* in 1560, few *Towns* received *Ministers*; and such as did, got only one: viz. *Knox* in *Edinburgh*, *Goodman* in *St. Andrew*,
B
Heriot

Heriot in Aberdeen, &c. and five Superintendents: And in the first General Assembly that ever was, there were but four and twenty Members, of whom only nine were Ministers, and the rest Laymen.

Will the *Presbyterians* dare to say, after this, That this Church was reformed from *Poperly* by *Presbytery*, when there were so many *Episcopal Clergymen* and *Laymen* concerned in it? Or, if they should be so bold as still to say so, will any of you be so credulous as to believe them? Nay, so far is it from being true, that the *Reformation* was begun by *Presbytry*, that none of our first Reformers were of *Presbyterian* principles. The famous Mr. *Wishart* was of the opinion, that personal gifts and graces were a sufficient warrant for exercising the sacred offices of the *Ministry*: yet he owned and revered the *Bishops*, and exhorted the people to do so too. If their Apostle *John Knox*, was a *Presbyterian*, according to the present principles of that *Seet*, he was not a rigid one; otherwise he cannot be vindicated from dissembling, a crime which his enemies never taxed him with: For, had he been a *Presbyterian*, and an enemy to *Episcopacy*, as his pretended followers represent him, he had many opportunities of testifying his sentiments: When he was asked in K. *Edward* the VI's Council in *England*, *Whether he thought it lawful to serve in ecclesiastical Ministrations according to the Rites and Laws of the Church of England*, when he wrote his *Admonition to the Commonalty of SCOTLAND*, when he wrote his *Faithful Admonition to the Professors of the Gospel in England*, and on many other occasions: yet he never offers to condemn *Episcopacy*, as, we may believe, he would have done, if his judgment had led him to it. So far was he from that, he owned the Authority of the *Bishops*, he called Archb—p. *Granmer Reverend Father in GOD*, he owned *Superintendents*, and himself was a *Commissioner of Visitation*; as much as to say, a temporary *Bishop*. In short, from all his works we may gather, that he was no enemy to *Episcopacy*, and that all he did and said against *Bishops*, was as they were *Popish*, or, as he calls them, *Antichristian Bishops*.

THE whole of our first Reformers were of the same mind with the Church of *England* in several momentous instances

stances in which our modern *Presbyterians* openly contradict and condemn that Church. They unanimously look'd upon the Communion of the *English Church* to be lawful; and, whenever occasion served, they never failed to communicate with her. Friar *Seton*, who fled in K. *James VI's* time, was made Chaplain to the Duke of *Suffolk*; Sir *John Borthwick* was charged with Heresy by the *popish* Clergy in 1540, for maintaining, That the *Liturgy of England* was commendable, and that the *Church of Scotland* should be governed after the same model with the *Church of England*: Rough one of the Earl of *Arran's* Chaplains was provided with a Benefice by the Archb—p of *York*; even *Knox* himself preached in the publick Churches in *England*, in subordination to the Bishop, and, in all his writings, calls himself one of the Ministers of the *Church of England*. Nay, in all their publick Deeds and Papers, our first Reformers openly and solemnly profess, That they were of one Religion and one Communion with the *Church of England*; and upon that score did they implore the assistance of the English Queen *Elizabeth*, to help them thoroughly to reform this Church. In the publick thanksgivings that were appointed after the *Pacification* 1560, they pray GOD, to confound the counsel of those that go about to break the most godly league contracted between them in his name: and, in many instances, they testify their unity and concord, in principles and doctrines, with Queen *Elizabeth* and the *English Church*, as reformed under her: and all the world knows, never any person, either in publick or private capacity, had a greater aversion at the *Presbyterians*, or, as they were then called, *Puritans*, than that Queen had; and never any age produced greater Champions against the *Presbyterian* Tenets than lived in her days.

Is it not strange, that, after all this, these *Schismatics* will still aver, that *Scotland* was reformed by *Presbytery*? But they have no regard to truth nor ingenuity, when the interests of their *Party* come in competition: and think to impose on the ignorance of well meaning people, by loud talk and great boasting, without argument and proof. When we see, from undeniable testimony, that so many *Episcopal Clergymen* and *Laymen* of all ranks, had the chief hand in promoting

promotting the *Reformation*, with any shew of order or authority: and that these *Reformers* were of the same mind with the *Church of England*, and openly profess their approbation of her and communion with her; which the present *Presbyterians* so plainly refuse to do: does not this shew, that if any favourable conclusion can be drawn from the inclinations of first *Reformers*, it is manifestly on our side, and full against the assertions of the *Presbyterians*. But,

Secondly, Tho' it were true, what they say, that the Nation was reformed by *Presbytery*, yet what strength can there be in that Argument, or what does it signify against our Cause? Was all the Nation obliged to stand by the decrees of a few assuming men, that took upon them to reform a *national Church*, without the consent of those in authority? Or, because two or three tumultuous *Preachers* found fault with some things in the *Constitution*, that did not suit their humour, must these things be immediately laid aside to please them? At this rate, no *Order* or *Policy* could ever be lasting: For there will still be *Fellows* in every *Commonwealth*, of a pragmatick, meddling spirit, that will be starting objections, raising difficulties, and would fain be mending what, they think, is amiss; and it is impossible to please all *parties*.

If *Episcopacy*, or the government of CHRIST's *Church* by *Bishops*, be a thing lawful and commendable, (not to say necessary, and, as it is, of *Divine Institution*,) will any impartial man consent to the abolishing of it, when a few seditious *Subjects*, that cannot bear to be commanded, rise up in *Rebellion* against it? If the present *Administration* be according to the *Laws* and *Statutes* of this Land, will it justify the insurrection of a few discontented *Rebels*, to say, *That they were not pleased with it, and that they wanted to remove it, in order to establish one more agreeable to their Taste?* If this were a maxim allowed in *State-politics*, there would soon be an end of government, and nothing would follow but *Anarchy* and *Confusion*. But,

The wisdom of all *States* has judged otherwise, and no man must meddle with these affairs, or if he does, he may expect the punishment which his rash Intrusion deserves. I the rather make this comparison to our *Presbyterians*, because

cause there is an Example at present that illustrates it, and in which they exert themselves with vigour, contrary to their avowed *Reformation*-principles: For if it was lawful for *John Knox*, and a few factious men with him, to quarrel with the settlement of the *Church* about 200 years ago, and to take up arms against their lawful *Sovereign* in defence of their own *Scheme*, is it not as lawful for the *Jacobite Party* now, to quarrel with the *Succession* in the present *Illustrious House*, and to do what they can, by force of Arms, to restore their, supposed, rightful PRINCE? Or, if these men be legally chargeable with *Rebellion*, for rising up against the *Powers that be*, are not the *reforming Preachers* the same? To any unbiass'd judgment this conclusion will naturally occur. But,

The *Presbyterians* say, The *Bishops* were *Papists* and *Idolaters*, and did a great many wrong things, and therefore it was necessary to take a course with them: And do not the present *Jacobites* say the same for themselves? Is it not all the plea they have to make, *That this Family are Usurpers and Foreigners, and do a great many things that they think wrong?* 'Tis natural for every body to have something to say in their own favour; and I believe no man, with any degree of honesty, ever opposed a thing but what he thought wrong: But who is the judge of publick right and wrong? Not every private man, I am sure: Or, if he do form a judgment of publick affairs, it must be only for himself, and must be kept to himself: He must not, in consequence of his private judgment, set up a reforming, changing and modelling as he thinks fit: especially when the thing is settled and confirmed by lawful authority, as the *Bishops*, at the *Reformation*, undeniably were: And, if they were, certainly it was a breach of Law in *John Knox*, and those with him, to abolish their Order, If what the *Presbyterians* say be true, that they, not only endeavoured but, actually did abolish them: For this, I fancy, is what they mean, when they tell us, that the Nation was reformed by *Presbytery*, that *Episcopacy* was laid aside, and the *Bishops* turn'd out at the *Reformation*. If this be their meaning, I wish they would plainly tell you so, and not cloke the disagreeableness of their story with fair Terms.

The

The love and affection which they find the generality of the Nation do still retain to that *venerable Order*, cannot be so easily rooted out; and therefore they endeavour to bring their *Presbytery* into vogue, by attributing to it the whole honour of the *Reformation*. But, If this be all the merit *Presbytery* can plead for itself, I hope, your eyes will be opened, and you'll take care, not to be imposed upon by them. For if *Presbytery* turn'd out *Episcopacy*, when it was settled by the *Laws* of the Land, and that without any other warrant, than the opinion of two or three presumptuous *Divines*, I cannot see, how they can justify themselves from the imputation of contraveining the *Laws*, or how we are obliged to imitate them.

All this I have said, on the supposition of the *Presbyterian's* plea being true: But that it is not true, I have shewed you already; and tho' it were true, it signifies nothing. Indeed for more than 50 years, from the year 1550, till the year 1603, we cannot well tell by what denomination to distinguish this *National Church*: All that time the Land was so harassed with *Reformations* and *Cross-Reformations*, and all without the consent, nay, some of them, directly against the allowance of lawful Authority.

Sometimes, a meeting of nine *Ministers* and thirty five *Laymen* call themselves the *General Assembly*, and pretend to make ecclesiastical *Laws* and *Canons* for the whole *Scottish Church*; Sometimes, the *Bishops* had the honour, and sometimes the power of sitting at the head of these *Assemblies*: At other times, the *Bishops* were kick'd out of doors, and a *Layman* (like *Buchanan*) preferred to be their *Moderator*; Sometimes, the *General Assembly* did all of itself, as if it had been the high Court of the Nation: And the next year perhaps, a pretended *Parliament* would clip the *Assembly's* wings, and leave them scarce a shadow of power.

In 1560, there were appointed *Superintendents*, by way of *Bishops*, with power to visit *Diocesses* and censure *Ministers*: when they were out of humour with this confusion, *Superintendency* was voted useless. When the E. of *Mar* was Regent, in the *General Assembly* holden at *Leith*, in *January* 1572, it was agreed, That the old *Episcopal Power* and *Titles* should be revived, and that the *Church* should be govern-
ed

ed by *Archbishops, Bishops, &c.* as it used to be: But this *Polity* soon displeased too, the *General Assembly* took the Rule into their hands again, and, for a beginning of it, they deposed *Paton* Bishop of *Dunkeld*; this irritated the Regent *Morton* so far, that he immediately packt them off, and resettled the *Bishops*.

When K. *James* the VI. took the management into his own hands, the *Presbyterians*, now come to a greater height, tried what they could do with him; and, partly by cunning, partly by threats, they got him, with difficulty, to do something in their behalf. And on some kind of footing they stood from 1592, to 1603, endeavouring as far as possible, to keep themselves in power, by the same methods they took to get into it; by seditious practices and inflaming the hearts of their followers, against the *King*. This he was abundantly sensible of, but had not power sufficient to redress it. The troubles of the Nation, during his Mother's imprisonment in *England*, had given them so much sway, and their Doctrines and Sermons, tending so much to *Rebellion* and *Disobedience*, had so poisoned the minds of a great part of the Nation, that he found it almost impossible to reduce them to their duty: And so we are not to wonder, that he was forced into several disagreeable steps by their dangerous solicitations, which he was under a necessity of complying with.

But when, upon the death of Q. *Elizabeth*, he went up into *England*, to take upon him the government of that Kingdom, he was then able to act as a King, and to shake off those fetters, with which the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland* had endeavoured to keep him down. Accordingly in his first Parliament after that, in the year 1603, by the unanimous consent of his Council, *Episcopacy* was settled upon a firm and lasting Basis. And because that *sacred Order* was expired by the death of the reformed *Bishops*, and the *Presbyterians* not allowing their *Seesto* to be filled up, Commission was given to some of the *English Bishops* to consecrate *Bishops* for this *Church*, according to the practice of the primitive *Church*, in ages of the purest *Antiquity*.

This may be called the *Æra* of the *Reformation* in this Kingdom: All that was done before, being done without authority, or cunningly brought about by falsehood and guile

How

How the *Church* stood after that, is obvious to all that know any thing of history. All the time of K. *James* the VI. and about 12 years after, the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland* and *Puritans* in *England* were very calm: For that King left the *Noblemen* and others of the *Laity* in the peaceable possession of these parts of the *Church-patrimony*, which they had seized on at the beginning of the *Reformation*: And the *Presbyterian party*, being forsaken by such able supports, made but little head. But,

When his Son K. *Charles* the I. succeeded, he formed a design of recovering all these Lands out of *Lay-hands*, and restoring them to the *Church*; which the *Laity* fearing, and unwilling to quit so rich a prize, took counsel against him, how to defeat his intentions: and finding the *Presbyterian* Preachers ready to join with them, they all together form'd that famous *BOND of mutual Defence* called, *The Solemn League and Covenant*, which made such a stir in the three Kingdoms; and nothing occasioned all the troubles and calamities that followed, but the pious zeal of the *King* on the one part, and the sacrilegious covetousness of some of the *Laity*, encouraged by the seditious counsels of the *Presbyterian* Ministers on the other. In end *Episcopacy* was suppress'd, not only in *Scotland*, where it had, for a hundred years past, met with several blows, but even in *England* itself, where it had stood it's ground, sacred and untouched, ever since *England* became christian. In it's room the *Presbyterians*, in both Kingdoms, thought to have been masters; but *Cromwel* kept them much at under: And all the time of his power there was a bastard kind of thing encouraged, made up of *Presbytery* and *Independency*.

In this state our *Church* continued for nineteen years, till at the *Restoration*, in 1660, K. *Charles* the II. revived the Laws for establishing *Episcopacy*, on the footing which his Grandfather had fixed it upon; in which situation it stood for 28 years, till, upon the general disgust that the Nation took at K. *James* the VII. the *Presbyterian* Party sided with the P. of *Orange*; and, by false insinuations and manifest untruths, impos'd so far upon that Stranger Prince, as to get *Episcopacy* abolished, and themselves settled in the enjoyment of the *Church livings*. The most of you know, what

was

was the reason that the P. of *Orange* did so much for them, that it was because the *Bishops* and their *Clergy* could not think of shaking off the *Allegiance* they had once plighted to *K. James*; and which, in conscience, they thought they were bound to adhere to, in a peaceable way, even to the loss of all their *Preferments*. And, every body knows, that *Prince* would never have favoured the *Presbyterians* so far, if the *Episcopal* Party would have approved of his measures. By this *Settlement*, in 1688, the *Presbyterians* have hitherto maintain'd their ground, and the *Episcopal* Party hath still been kept out of the *Church-livings* by the same scruple of Conscience, which was the first cause of their being laid aside.

THUS I have traced the *Presbyterians* from their first appearance, in *K. James* the Vth's time, down to our own days; and have shewn you, That this *Church* was reform'd, not by *Presbytery*, as they say, nor by men of *Presbyterian* principles; But chiefly by *Episcopal Clergymen* and *Laymen* agreeing in principle and doctrine with the *Church of England* under *Q. Elizabeth*: That altho' it had been reform'd by *Presbytery*, yet, that was no tie nor obligation upon us, neither are we bound to imitate the first *Reformers* in any thing they did contrary to *Law*: And when the *Presbyterians* got themselves settled, it was by the covetous views of aspiring *Noblemen*, and by reason of the stiffness of the *Episcopal Clergy* in persevering in their *Allegiance* to their *Sovereign*. By all which it appears, that their present assertions have no foundation, but are designed to intrap credulous and unwary people.

§ II.

LET us now examine the *Constitution* of this *Kirk* of theirs in it's several parts, and we shall find, that their *Model* is as erroneous as their *Original* is confused: For when men take to themselves the liberty to vent every idle notion which their giddy brain produces, and that too with the assurance that their opinion is exactly agreeable to the Word of *GOD*, how is it possible, but that the world must be filled with *Nonsense*, *Absurdity* and *Contradiction*? Thus it was with the followers of *John Knox*, from whom, with several

ral Deviations and several Additions, the *Presbyterians* are sprung.

Every thing they published, they boldly maintained to be consonant to *GOD's Word*: As indeed, so it was, according to their forc'd and farfetch'd interpretation of it; and of the justness of their interpretations, they would allow none to be Judges but themselves. The *Bishops* and their *Clergy* they vilified as ignorant Sotts, that knew nothing, and so not qualified to judge in such weighty matters: And *John Knox*, in many places, boasts, he was able to maintain his point against all the *Doctors* and *Divines* in the kingdom as well he might, when he had a frantick *Rabble* at his back, ready to second all he said, with a blind applause, and to fly in the face of all that would contradict him. Of this stamp were the men that found fault with the then *Church*, and would force interpretations of *Scripture*, to introduce and settle, what they called, a better *Scheme* of their own devising. But let us see the truth of this in the branches of their *Constitution*, their *Government*, *Doctrine* and *Worship*.

First, As to the *Government* of their *Kirk*, when we take a thorough view of it, nothing will appear more disorderly and absurd. Every single *Parish-Preacher* takes upon him, indeed, to be the same with the old *Christian Bishops*, and will tell you, that his dignity is as great as that of *Timothy*, *Titus* or *Epaphroditus*, &c. His *Kirk-Session*, of six or eight *Lay-Elders*, resembles the antient *Diocesan Councils*, if you'll believe his own word: and when he sits at the head of that renowned *Jury*, you must think, you see one of the antient *Fathers*, like *St. Cyprian*, presiding in the venerable *Assembly* of his *Presbyters*, such is the assuming pride of these men; and a pride too, that must be founded on falsehoods and groundless assertions. They'll maintain, that *St. James* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, or *St. Chrysostom* Bishop of *Constantinople*, or *St. Athanasius* of *Alexandria*, were but like their *Parish-Ministers*, and all their power extended only to be *Moderators* of their respective *Kirk-Sessions*. As if in a large Town, like any of these three, one *Clergyman* could suffice, even with the help of an unordain'd *Kirk-Session* or, as if the *Presbyters*, that had the charge of men's Souls under the *Bishop's* inspection, were only dumb *Lay-Elders*.

But
of o
one
gree
rish
B
have
put t
tunit
in thi
the A
Com
the m
so on
Ordin
Refor
from
is it,
and, h
thorit
by pop
sterity
on the
holy r
tell yo
bly an
extrao
proof
which
this sec
as the
This v
In r
" ry T
" GO
" for
" time
" gift
sion of
cramen

But see the vainglory and stubbornness of these Neighbours of ours; they cannot bear subjection to a *Bishop*, yet every one of them must be a *Bishop* himself, and thinks he is as great, and exercises as much spiritual power in his own *Parish* as any old *Bishop* ever did in his *Diocefs*.

But, my brethren, if you ask them what *Commission* they have to show for this spiritual power of theirs, I fear, you'll put them to a Nonplus. Any of you, that have the opportunity, may enquire at the *Presbyterian Bishop* among you in this *Parish*, *What way he can deduce his Ordination from the Apostles, or whether he pretends to go so far back for his Commission?* Why, he was ordained by a *Presbytery*, and the members of ~~that~~ *Presbytery* by another *Presbytery*, and so on, till the beginning of the *Reformation*, that all their Ordinations center in the persons of *John Knox* and the first *Reformers*, and there they stop, they can go no further. But from whom had the first *Reformers* their Ordination? This is it, that puts them to a stand. Either they were *Laymen*, and, having set up themselves for *Preachers*, without any authority, pretended to ordain others; or they were ordain'd by *popish Bishops*, which will be a great vexation to their posterity to think, that any power they have, was conferred on them by *Papists*. Rather than admit such a stain on their holy religion, they will begin their power at *John Knox*, and tell you, that he and some more at that time, were invisibly and immediately commissioned by *GOD*; and that the extraordinary *Gifts* these men were blest with, was a sure proof of their authority. This is the pretty foundation on which the whole weighty structure of *Presbytery* is built, and this *secret Call*, as they term it, they insist upon, and plead as the only warrant they have, for exercising *sacred Offices*. This was plainly the mind of some of our first *Reformers*.

In 1558, it was concluded, “*That the Brethren in every Town should assemble together, &c. till it should please GOD to give the gift of Exhortation by Sermon to some, for the comfort and instruction of the rest.*” And at that time, *zealous men exhorted their brethren, according to the gifts and graces granted unto them.*” And in the *Confession of Faith*, presented to the Parliament, in 1560, the *Sacraments* are said to be ministred by *lawful Ministers*, whom
we

we affirm, say they, “*To be only they that are appointed to the preaching of the Word, or, into whose mouths GOD hath put some Sermon of Exhortation.*”

There seems, indeed, to be some excuse for the *Reformers* in this: They found the *popish Bishops* madly incensed against them, and positive not to countenance their designs any manner of way: And seeing nothing could be done toward a *Reformation*, without setting apart some certain men to be *Preachers* and *Ministers*, rather than have the *Work* stopt by the obstinacy of the *Bishops*, to whom the *Ordination* of *Ministers* belonged, they made a fashion of ordaining them themselves: And from the inclinations, profession and behaviour of these *Reformers*, in other instances, we may conclude, that if the *popish Bishops*, at that time, would have complied with them, they would never have invaded their province of *Ordination*.

’Tis true, they are not without blame: for an unlawful thing should never be committed, tho’ with ever so good an intention, and no man must do evil; that good may come of it. And it was not only unlawful in them, to take upon them the *ministerial Function*, without a lawful *Mission*; but their plea of extraordinary gifts and graces is likewise quite ridiculous and vain.

When our blessed LORD called himself the *Son of GOD*, did the *Jews* believe him; or did he desire them to believe him, on his own word? No, he appeals to the *Miracles* which he wrought; *These* (says he) *testify of me.*

If the *Presbyterians* will do some mighty thing, or shew some miraculous sign, to demonstrate the inward call of the *Spirit*, we will believe them. But let them tell you what extraordinary gift was to be seen about the *Presbyterian Reformers*. A great many of them were plain, simple men, that found fault with the corruptions of the *Church of Rome*, but they knew very little about the *Constitution* of the *Catholick Church*: They fear’d no danger and spar’d no pains, in publickly explaining the *Scriptures* to the people: And the most of them were men of strict morality, and untainted characters. But what of all that? Were these extraordinary *Gifts*? So extraordinary, as to intitle them to extraordinary privileges? Were any of them gifted with the power of working

Miracles

Mira
Dead
out th
extra
any
count
than t
an un
extrac
could
stry, w
If t
nisters
ments
an the
at first
thod b
this P
withou
selves
supply
ed for
cordin
extrao
Elders
cimen
reason
ed me
may no
nying
ly men
their C
be any
hath as
er, and
and m
neighb
Etabl
You
ment is

Miracles, or wonderfully healing the *Sick*, or raising the *Dead* to life, or bringing about any supernatural effect, without the help of visible means, all which the *Apostles*, these extraordinary gifted men, were enabled to do? I never heard any of them that pretended to this. And by all the accounts we have of them, there was nothing about them more than there is about the most of their followers now-a-days, an unseasonable, unbridled *Zeal*, and a mighty pretence to extraordinary *Sanctity* and *Devotion*. And if these *Gifts* could qualify men, in those days, for the office of the *Ministry*, why not the same *Gifts* qualify men to that *Office* now?

If they can produce no other *Right* for their being *Ministers*, and for taking upon them to administer the *Sacraments* of *CHRIST*'s appointment, hath not every Christian the same *Right*? If their *Ordinations* were performed, at first, by well gifted *Laymen*, why should not the same method be observed now? I should think, the *Presbyterians* in this *Parish*, on the death of their last *Preacher*, might have without any further ceremony, chosen out among themselves a well gifted Brother, if any such there had been, to supply his place, and preach and pray to them, and not waited for the formality of a *Presbytery*-Settlement; which, according to their own doctrine, there is no need for, where extraordinary gifts and graces are. May not one of Mr. B.'s *Elders* mount the pulpit, and give the congregation a specimen of his *Gifts* in his turn? And if the *Reformers* had reason to complain of the *Bishops*, for denying godly, gifted men the liberty to preach *GOD*'s *Word* to the people, may not the people now complain of their *Preachers* for denying them the same liberty? Or are there no gifted, godly men among them but their *Preachers*? I scarce think, their *Congregations* will allow that to be said: And if there be any such man to be found in a *Congregation*, that man hath as good a *Call* to be a *Minister*, as their present *Preacher*, and if he should take upon him to preach and pray, and make a fashion of administering the *Sacraments* to his neighbours, I cannot see how the *Presbytery*, by their own *Establishment*, could well quarrel him.

You see, what a mass of confusion their *Church-Government* is. I need not speak of their *Synods* and *General Assemblies*,

blies, these upstart *Judicatures*, that are always minting at the *Episcopal* Power, and in which there is as much tyranny usurp'd by parties of caballing men, and as haughtily exercised over their weaker brethren, as ever they complain'd of in the *Lord Bishops*. Thus is the *Kirk of Scotland* governed in a way that no *Church* in the world ever observed, and which was never observed nor heard of, for more than a thousand years after there was a *Church* here.

Secondly, Let us take a view of some of their *Doctrines*, and we shall find them not a whit better. Their *Doctrine of Predestination*, what tendency can it be said to have, but to harden poor creatures into despair, and to affront the *Sacred Majesty* of Heaven, with the ridiculous characters of *Partiality* and *Injustice*? For if it be true, that *GOD* has from all eternity elected some to *everlasting Life*, and ordained others to *eternal Misery*, meerly out of his own good pleasure, without any other respect whatever, does it not make *GOD* a very absolute *Being*, without any mixture of goodness or mercy? And does it not quite silence all the arguments that can be used for encouraging *Virtue* and discouraging *Vice*? For, says the *Sinner*, "If *GOD* has ordain'd me to Happiness, let me do what I will, his Decrees must stand, and no Sin that I can commit, can alter his Predestination: Or if he has ordain'd me to be damn'd, will my Prayers and Repentance and Faith and good works reverse my doom, or change my Reprobation? Why need I trouble my self with the austerities of a virtuous Life, or deny myself the pleasures and gratifications of the world, since, after all, *GOD*'s Decrees must stand, and I must be judged not according to what I do, but to what *GOD* has aforehand determined concerning me? Can any thing be said after this, to reform such a *Sinner*, or what arguments will prevail with a man that is taught such a *Doctrine*?

Why, say they, *St. Paul* is very exprefs for *Predestination* and *Election*, and is not his authority sufficient for our teaching and preaching any *Doctrine*, let the consequences be what they will? Be it so, But does not *St. Peter* observe, That there are several places in *St. Paul*'s writings, which even in his days the ignorant and unstable were in danger of wresting to their own destruction? And I am afraid, this

passage

passage of his may be one of these. 'Tis the IXth. Chapter of his Epistle to the *Romans*, out of which the *Presbyterians*, here and abroad, draw their arguments for *Predestination* and *Reprobation*: not considering that St. Paul is there speaking of the casting off the *Jews* and choosing the *Gentiles*, to be the *Church* of CHRIST in after ages: without any respect to the salvation or damnation of particular persons. He tells them, that GOD loved *Jacob*, and hated *Esau*, without seeing any good in the *one*, to deserve his *Love*, or any ill in the *other*, to incur his *Hatred*.

By *Jacob* is represented the *Church of the Jews*, and by *Esau* the *Gentiles*. And the *Apostle's* meaning is, That the *Jews* were to be GOD's chosen people, without any deservings of theirs to merit so high a privilege. And his design in this is, to stop the mouths of the *Roman Christians* from glorying, that they were now to be the *Church* of CHRIST to the exclusion of the *Jews*. The whole strain of the Chapter shows this. We are not to think, that St. Paul meant, that *Jacob* was chosen to salvation, and *Esau* to be damn'd, I scarce think the *Apostle* would have gone so far. But this hath occasioned the mistake of a great many, otherwise well-meaning men: that they applied what the *Apostle* says in this Chapter, to particular persons, whereas the *Apostle* design'd it for the *Jews* and *Gentiles* in general.

Even the great St. *Augustine* himself was a little imposed upon in this point. The *Presbyterians* think, they have a mighty *Patron*, by having him to defend their *Doctrine*: But of all men it becomes them worst, to cite St. *Augustine*, or any of the *Fathers*, in their own cause; they that at other times speak so disrespectfully of them, and so plainly contradict them. St. *Augustine* was a very learned man, and did a vast deal of good to the *Church*: But he was a man: He was not infallible: He was liable to be mistaken, and every private opinion of his is not to be a Rule to the whole *Church*. Yet even in this point he behaves himself very modestly and with a certain diffidency, so unusual to him at other times. They need not disturb the ashes of that great man for countenancing a *Doctrine*, which he indeed did advance, but with much hesitation and uncertainty.

I know in K. *James* the VI's time, at the *Dutch Synod*
of

of *Dort*, this Article of *Predestination* and some other *Presbyterian* Doctrines were settled in *Holland*, and the opposers of them were ever after branded with the odious title of *Arminians*: a trick which the *Presbyterians* have still been good at, to dress up their *Antagonists* in hateful names, as *Nero* did the *Christians* in Pitch-coats, to devour them with the greater torment. But they don't consider, how much they contradict themselves in their *Shorter Catechism*, which was compiled for the instruction of children, the first question is, *What is the chief End of Man?* And they are taught to answer, That it is to glorify *GOD* and enjoy him forever. Let them reconcile these two pieces of *Divinity*, That the chief end of a man's creation is to enjoy *GOD*, and yet that *GOD* hath created him to eternal damnation. I believe no body will attempt it but themselves; as no body but they are in danger of falling into such a blunder. This is their distinguishing doctrine of *Predestination*, which some of the present generation of them are beginning to be ashamed of: yet it stands on record, as one of their fundamental, and not to be doubted, doctrines of the *Church of Scotland* to this day.

And what shall we say of that other doctrine of theirs in the same *Shorter Catechism*, That *No meer man since the fall is able perfectly to keep the commandments of GOD, but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed*. A doctrine quite contrary to the whole tenure of the *Scriptures*, and the express declaration of our *SAVIOUR* himself: He tells us, *His yoke is easy and his burden light*. Yet say the *Presbyterians* 'tis a yoke very hard and a burden so weighty, that never *Man* was able to bear it. The commandments of *GOD* are not grievous, says *St. John*. But, say they, they are so very grievous, that 'tis impossible to keep so much as one of them. *St. Luke* speaking of *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth*, commends them for walking in all the ordinances and commandments of *GOD* blameless. Yet the *Presbyterians* deny this testimony, and will tell you, there was never one that walked in any of the commandments of *GOD* blameless. They make no scruple of contradicting the inspir'd Writers of the *Gospel*, yea, of contradicting our *LORD* himself. No wonder if, after that, they fly in the face of common reason,

son to support this antiscritptural doctrine. To what purpose hath *GOD* given us commandments to keep, if we be not able to keep them? Or, why should he punish us for breaking his *Laws*, that are so far above our abilities? Certainly *GOD* Almighty knows what we are, and what we can do, and he neither requires nor expects, any thing from us, but what we are able to do. And to say, that *GOD* exacts of us an obedience, which he knows we are not able to give, is to represent him in the most disagreeable light that can be. Would it not be as severe and unreasonable in our *Creator*, to condemn us for not keeping commandments, which we were not able to keep, as it would be in any of you to quarrel, or turn off a Servant, for not lifting a burthen above his strength? Indeed, if we had no other notion of *GOD*, but as a *Being* of almighty power, and uncontroul'd dominion, there might be some room for such a representation of him. But when we know, that his power is managed by infinite wisdom, and his dominion over us sweetned with the height of mercy, how shall we entertain such harsh, unbecoming thoughts of him? This is but excusing our own laziness and indolence, by laying the blame at our *Maker's* door. If we were heartily willing, we should soon find ourselves able. The same *CHRIST*, that strengthned St. Paul to do all things, is still ready and able to endue us with the same strength. Of ourselves indeed, by our own ability, without the assistance of *GOD's* grace, any thing that is good is above our reach, because we are naturally inclin'd to that which is evil, and *in us, that is in our flesh, dwelleth no good thing*. But the *Presbyterians* speak nothing of the all sufficiency of this grace; and, without any distinction, make it utterly impossible to keep the commandments. But,

I would ask them, Can we do any thing, unless *GOD* help us? Can we breathe, or walk, or so much as move the fingers of our body? Is not *GOD's* assistance necessary to the performance of these and every other bodily operation? But how absurd would it be to say, That no meer man is able to walk, or breathe, or do any thing? Yet as well say that, as say, *No meer man is able to keep the Commandments*: since we must have *GOD's* help to the one as well as to the other. What they mean by *meer man* here, they have not

D

told

told us: The general notion is, that it signifies all *mankind*, in opposition* to *Christ Jesus*, who was *GOD-Man*. But, perhaps they will say, that it signifies a man unassisted by the divine grace, and in this sense we very readily join with them. But one should think, ingenuity and honesty would require them to deliver their doctrines in such clear terms, as every one understands when he reads them: And, no doubt, so they would, if their doctrines were such, as could bear to be distinctly delivered. But,

I proceed to take notice of what they call, by way of eminence, *THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE*, *That we are justified only by FAITH*: A position which I freely own, I do not understand. If they mean, that it is by a lively and unfeigned *Faith* in *JESUS CHRIST*, that all our good works are accepted with *GOD*, I scarce think, any sober, orthodox Christian will refuse to join with them. But this is not their meaning. They exclude any kind of good works from being in the least necessary to our *Justification*: And they say, *The Sinner is justified, by means of CHRIST's Righteousness imputed to him, and received by FAITH alone*. Does not this make it a thing indifferent, whether we do any good or not, since all the good we can do signifies nothing? If we can but arrive to such a strong degree of *Faith*, and can but receive, rest, and roll ourselves upon *CHRIST*, (to speak in their own phrase) all will be well. Nay, so fond were some of them of this *Doctrine* at first, that Mr. *Patrick Hamilton* taught, *That as good works do not make us good, so evil works do not make us evil*. 'Tis the grace of *GOD* indeed that makes us good, and a good man doth that which is good: But what is it that makes a man evil, if it be not evil works? They will not say, that *GOD* made any man evil. Neither can any temptation of the *Devil*, or allurement of the *World*, make a man evil till he listen to them: And when he listens to them, that is an evil work. Unless evil works make a man evil I cannot see how he can ever become evil. We do not say, that good works make a man good, because this were to attribute merit to ourselves: Neither do we say, that a man can be good without good works.

For defence of this their *Doctrine* they quote St. *Paul* in his III. Chapter to the *Romans*, where, at the 28th verse,

he say
the L
ter te
out w
To vi
that v
of the
were
ed by
batizi
were
that y
Gospe
CHR
this po
Apost
on. It
ed in t
of St.
we are
forth
and, c
them.
and th
monia
fied by
'Tis
is not
cluded
the Go
Neigh
a Sinne
justifie
he is el
ies, wi
at that
ed by
eagerly
them o
remoni
he

he says, *A man is justified by Faith, without the deeds of the Law.* But of what *Law*? The whole tenure of the chapter tells us, he means the deeds of the *Jewish Law*, without which, he says, a man is justified by *Faith in Christ*. To vindicate St. *Paul*, we need only observe the great stir that was in the *Church* at this time, about the observation of the *Jewish Ceremonies*. Some Christians thought they still were bound to observe all the *Rites and Ceremonies* instituted by *Moses*, such as *Circumcision, Fastings, Washings, Sabbathizing, &c.* and this sort were called *Judaizers*. Others were of opinion, that *CHRIST* had exempted them from that yoke of servitude, and that they were now under the *Gospel*, they were for standing fast in the liberty wherewith *CHRIST* had made them free. And so great a height did this point come to, that nothing less than the authority of an *Apostolical Council* (*Acts xv.*) could determine the *Question*. It seems the Christians at *Rome* were very much divided in this affair, and to solve their doubt, is the main design of St. *Paul's* Epistle to them. He tells them, *III. 24. that we are now justified by the death of CHRIST, that henceforth we have no dependance on the works of the old Law, and, consequently, under no obligation to the performance of them. That all these ceremonial observances are done away, and that as Abraham was justified by Faith, before the ceremonial Law was instituted, so are Christians likewise justified by Faith, now that the ceremonial Law is ceased.*

'Tis plain that what he says of *works or deeds of the Law* is not to be applied to *works of the Gospel*: For had he excluded the performance of *moral duties*, as commanded by the *Gospel*, such as the Love of *GOD* and the Love of our *Neighbour*, had he excluded these from the *justification* of a *Sinner*, or had it been his meaning, that the *Sinner* can be justified without these, we should not find him so earnest, as he is elsewhere, in recommending and inculcating these duties, without distinction, on all Christians whatever. But as, at that time Christians were in such danger of being enslaved by *Jewish Rites*, which some of the *Jewish Converts* so eagerly contended for, he makes it his business to convince them of the vanity, insufficiency and needlessness of such *Ceremonies*, by assuring them, that now under the *Gospel*, the
Sinner

Sinner is justified without these, by a hearty and unshaken Faith in *Jesus Christ*. This is clearly *St. Paul's* meaning, and the same is to be observed of what the old *Fathers* write on this subject.

In most places of their writings the whole *Gospel-æconomy* goes under the name of *FAITH*, to distinguish it from the old abrogated *System of Jewish Ceremonies*, which are therefore called *WORKS*: And when any such sentence occurs, *That a man is justified by Faith, or without Works*, their meaning is, That we are no more to have recourse to the *Rites and Observations* of the *Mosaick Law*, for making us well pleasing to *GOD*; but must look for acceptance with him, only from the sincere, conscientious performance of *Gospel-Duties*, as we are enabled by his grace, and by the merits of his *Son's* death, to perform them. *Origen* says, *The Thief on the Cross was justified by the Law of Faith, not by the Law of Works*. That is, not by a bare contemplative Faith, but such a Faith as had *Works* accompanying it: for he acknowledged himself a Sinner, and confessed he had justly deserved his fate. And on this *Act*, or *Work* of repentance, he was justified, as well on that *Act of Faith*, by which he own'd *JESUS CHRIST* to be the Son of *GOD*.

The great *St. Basil* calls that glorying in *GOD*, when we acknowledge, that 'tis not on account of any *Righteousness* of our own, but by *Faith in Jesus*, that we are justified, and this we must do, says he, to mortify our pride and vain-glory: *For what have we which we have not received?*

St. Ambrose speaks the mind of them all on this head, that it is purely owing to the goodness of *GOD* in *Christ*, that *Sinners* are justified: I will glory, says he, not that I am righteous, but that I am redeemed; Not that I am without Sin, but that my Sins are forgiven me; Not that I have done good, or that any person hath done me good, but that *Jesus Christ* is become my *Advocate* with the *FATHER* and hath shed his *Blood* for me." It were endless to enumerate all the passages of the *Fathers* which the *Presbyterians* have abused on this head. The whole drift of these antient *Worthies* is to show, That 'tis altogether owing to *GOD's* mercy that we are justified: That neither our *Faith*, nor our *Works*, nor any thing about us, can merit Salvation; but

we must receive it, and every thing that prepares us for it, as a *Gift*, not as a *Reward*. And this contradicts the *Presbyterian* Doctrine, tho' perhaps they don't think so: For what call they *Faith*? Is not *Faith* something of ours, and is it not a work of our soul, as well as *Love* or *Hope*, or any other *Works*, which they exclude from the Sinner's *Justification*? And is it not as assuming to ourselves to say, We are justified by *Faith*, in the *Presbyterian* sense of the word *Faith*, as to say, We are justified by *Almsgiving*, or *Prayer*, or *Forgiveness*, &c. The *Apostles* and *Fathers* are express both against the one and the other. Nothing that we can do can justify us in *GOD's* sight, neither *Faith*, nor good *Works*, without the meritorious Intercession of *CHRIST's* death. But, at the same time, their writings do teach, That good *Works* are as necessary to our *Justification*, as *Faith*, *necessitate præcepti*, (as the *Schoolmen* say) because *GOD* has commanded them, neither of them being necessary, *necessitate medii*, that is, being the means or instruments of it. Yet, without regard to this, this *Doctrine* of theirs has made a great noise for some time past.

The Church of *Rome* is faulty, in attributing so much virtue to good *Works* as they do, promising heaven and happiness to the performance of a great many bodily actions: And to bring off people from this dangerous belief, *Luther*, at his *Reformation*, set up *Faith alone* in opposition to good *Works*, an *Opinion* as dangerous, and as much against the current of *Scripture* and *Antiquity* as the other. So true it is, *Incidit in Scyllam cupiens vitare Charybdim*: Out of one wrong thing into another. The other *Reformers*, in other Nations, greedily laid hold on this, to have something to oppose the Church of *Rome* with: And so it was espoused by our *Reformers* too. But the *Catholick Doctrine* is, Neither *Faith* nor good *Works* justify us before *GOD*. Our *Justification* proceeds purely from *GOD's* grace: And *GOD* will not justify us by *Faith* without good *Works*, more than by good *Works* without *Faith*. If the *Presbyterians* would but reconcile their *Doctrine* to this, no Christian ever did, or ever will contradict them. But,

Their *Doctrine* of *Justification* by *CHRIST's* Righteousness imputed to us and received by *Faith* alone, is what scarcely

scarcely themselves can understand, for how is it possible that the Righteousness of one person can be imputed to another? The Scriptures, I'm sure, never speak after this manner: They tell us indeed, that *By one Man's obedience many were made righteous*, Rom. v. 18. but is that to say, that the obedience of CHRIST is imputed to us? Let the *Presbyterians* adduce but one plain passage of *Scripture*, where there is mention made of *imputed Righteousness*, and the *Cause* shall be their own. But till then, they must be at a loss how to prove and establish their Doctrine of *FAITH ALONE*, in their sense of the *Word*. S. James says, ii. 24. *We see then, a man is justified by Works and not by Faith only*. And ii. 14. *What avails it, that a man hath Faith without Works, will his Faith save him?* Yea, St. Paul himself argues against the *Presbyterians*, *If I have as great Faith, says he, as can remove mountains*, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. *and want Charity, it signifies nothing*: And he concludes in the 13th verse, *Now abideth Faith, Hope, Charity, But the greatest of these is Charity*. It were superfluous to heap up places of *Scripture*, where *good Works* are as much recommended to the *Justification* of a Sinner as *Faith*. Yet the *Presbyterians* will go against all these, against *Antiquity*, against *Reason*, purely to distinguish themselves above their neighbours. And these are the *Seducers* that would be perverting you, and struggle so much to draw you over to their *Party*. But we have not done with their *Doctrines* yet.

It would seem, their great labour is to overturn the necessity of all *moral Duties*, and encourage people in the utmost supineness and laziness: otherwise how could they allow themselves to persuade people, as they do, that it is impossible for them to resist the operations of the *Divine Grace*, but that *GOD*, by his Almighty Power, can force us, and will force us, to a compliance with his *Will*, and will make us holy here and happy hereafter, as he created us at first, without our own consent? Sure nothing could ever have been invented more prejudicial to *Piety* and *Virtue*, than this *Doctrine* is. If this were true, what man would be to blame for continuing in *Sin*? How could the *Pharisees* and *Lawyers* be condemned, for rejecting the Counsel of *GOD* toward themselves, St. Luke viii. 30. since they had never

got

got a touch of this *irresistible Grace* to compell them to accept it? Indeed, as I observed before, without *GOD's* grace to help us, we can do nothing: We can neither breathe, nor move, nor walk: but does *GOD* force us to do any of these by an irresistible operation? Or, is it impossible for us to resist his help in these motions? The case is the same in a spiritual sense: *GOD* helps us, but does not compel us: His Grace assists us, but that's not to say, that his omnipotence obliges us. The *Presbyterians*, to get over this difficulty, have recourse to the old *Jesuitical* knack of distinguishing: They distinguish *Grace* into general *Grace* and special *Grace*. *GOD's* general *Grace*, say they, is given to all men, and may be resisted: But his special *Grace* is only extended to the *Elect*, and still produces the design'd effect: And for this distinction they are indebted to *Prosper* Bishop of *Rhegium*, and *Fulgentius* Bishop of *Rhuspa*, the only two of the *Antients* that in the least seem to favour this *Doctrine* of the irresistibility of the Divine *Grace*. And they fell into this extream from their too great heat in opposing the *Heresy* of *Pelagius*, who magnified man's *Free will* and natural abilities too much, on the other hand. And it very often happens, that men disputing too warmly against one *Error*, have, unawares, fallen into another equally as pernicious: As was the case with these two *Fathers* in the present point. But never any of the primitive *Worthies*, before them, spoke in such a strain: And when the fear of the *Pelagian* *Heresy* was ceased, that way of speaking ceased also. But,

If this *Doctrine* be against *Scripture*, no authority whatever can defend it. Not to say that *Prosper* and *Fulgentius* have advanced any thing against *Scripture*; I have a greater regard for all the orthodox *Fathers*, than imagine so. But if it be against *Scripture*, 'tis next to a proof, that these two *Fathers* never advanc'd it, but in a true sense, tho' perhaps in the midst of their disputations, they have dropt some unguarded expressions.

And that it is contrary to *Scripture*, innumerable passages stand on record, as undeniable demonstrations. *What more could have been done to my Vineyard, Isa. v. 4. that I have not done to it? Wherefore, when I looked, that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes? O Jerusalem*

*Salem, Jerusalem, St. Matth. viii. 37. thou that killest the Prophets, and stonedst them that were sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not? These things, I say, says our Saviour, (St. John v. 34.) that ye might be saved. And ye will not come unto me, v. 40. that ye might have life. Ye stiffnecked, and uncircumcised, says St. Stephen to the Jews, Acts vii. 31. Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: As your Fathers did, so do ye. Many are called, Matth. xxii. 14. but few chosen. To which we may add, Ezek. xviii. 31. Acts iii. 19. Rom. xii. 2. Eph. v. 14 i. John iii. 28. Deut. xxx. 19. Acts xiii. 46. and xxvi. 18. and many more, where GOD Almighty begs, beseeches and expostulates with us to do our duty. He desires us to turn from the evil of our ways, as well as pray to him to turn us. St. Paul exhorts us to *work out our Salvation with fear and trembling*, for this very reason, because *it is GOD that worketh in us*. In short, nothing is plainer from *Scripture*, than that men may, and many men too often do, resist the operations of GOD's grace: And, as St. Paul expresses it, *do grieve the good Spirit of GOD, whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption. By the grace of GOD*, says St. Paul, *I am what I am, and his grace which was bestowed upon me, was not in vain*, i Cor. xv. 10. Now, If the grace of GOD be irresistible in all men, why does St. Paul speak so distinguishingly of the efficacy of it in himself? But his saying, that GOD's grace was not bestowed upon him in vain, plainly implies that it may be, and is oft times, bestowed in vain, and consequently cannot be irresistible.*

All that our adversaries can bring to strengthen their Doctrine, is some metaphorical passages of *Scripture*, which they wrest and misapply to their own purpose; such as *Being dead in Sin*, Ephes. ii. 1. *Being blind*, St. Luke iv. 18. *Servants to Sin*, Rom. vi. 17. *Flesh opposing the Law of GOD*, Rom. viii. 17. and two or three more of that strain, from which, without a manifest force, no Interpreter can draw an argument for the irresistibility of *Grace*. In a word, if this Doctrine be admitted and believed, there follows a blind fatality in men's actions, and an absolute necessity for every thing that is done, whether good or evil. It leaves no

room

room for the commendations and rewards of *Virtue*, since there can be no *Virtue* where there is no *Choice*, and *irresistible Grace* destroys the liberty of chusing. Nay, it makes *GOD* Almighty the author and cause of all the Impieties and Wickednesses, which are committed in the world: and it affords a very valid excuse for every Sinner to plead in his own defence, yea, it contradicts their other *Doctrine*, which I have touch'd before, *That no meer man is able to keep the Commands*: for if grace be *irresistible*, certainly it can compel the good man to keep all and every one of *GOD*'s commandments: otherways if in any instance he fails, in that very instance he resists *irresistible* grace. Such and so incoherent, are their doctrines with one another. But to proceed,

They teach likewise, that *CHRIST* did not die for all the World, but only for the *Elect*, and in this sence in their Shorter Catechism they call him the *Redeemer of GOD's Elect*. And this is a necessary consequence of their horrid doctrine of *Reprobation*, they endeavour to support it with some few Places of *Scripture* bended down to their sence by explications and distinctions, and with the testimonies of one or two African *Fathers*, that liv'd about the 6th or 7th Century. But the *Scripture* is so very full to the contrary, that we cannot but wonder how any, even pretended Christian, can be in a doubt as to the Truth, *That Christ died for all men, that he dyed for the World, that he laid down his Life for all and every one that believe in his Name*, these are doctrines so obvious, that you cannot cast up your Bibles without discovering them. But our *Presbyterians* would wrest these assertions to their meaning, and will tell you, that wherever you find mention made of *CHRIST's dying for ALL MEN* and *for the WORLD*, by *ALL MEN* and by *ALL THE WORLD* there is meant the *Faithful* or the *Elect*. And so positive was *Beza* on this Head, that in his translation of the Bible, in all these passages he translated the Greek word, which signifies *ALL*, by a Latin word which signifies *MANY*, a sure sign of weak cause, which needed such a shift to support it; but granting, that *ALL* signifies *MANY*, will they say, that the *World* signifies the *Elect*? The word

WORLD is in many places used to signifie what the *Presbyterians* call THE REPROBATE, but never inso much as one place is it used clearly to denote the *Elect* yet : even allowing them that forc'd Interpretation, we have other proofs which they can never get over. Our Saviour says, *he came not to call the Righteous but Sinners to Repentance*, And St. *John* tells to our comfort : *If any man sin he has an Advocate with the Father, JESUS CHRIST the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world.* Sure nothing can be plainer.

Against all this, say they, the Scripture speaks of CHRIST's dying for *Many* : Very good, but what are these *Many* : As by ONE mans disobedience many were made Sinners, Rom. 5. 19. so by the obedience of ONE many were made righteous. Let them explain that verse in any shape they please, so be they admit the word MANY to have the same meaning in both places. Besides they will not say, that CHRIST's dying for MANY signifies his dying for the *Elect*, According to their belief, the *Elect* are not many : *Many are called but few chosen* ; had the Scripture in any place said, that CHRIST died for the *Elect*, as clearly as it says CHRIST dy'd for ALL, how would they have triumphed over us. And then for their Authorities from *Antiquity*, the *Fathers* that seem to be of their mind, express themselves with great modesty and submission to the judgment of other *Fathers*, that may be of a contrary Opinion : And, which is observable too, their great Patrons are a Council of 14 Bishops at *Lyons*, as far down as the year 855, which Council even allows their Doctrine to have a pious meaning, and to be maintain'd by many of the *Antients*. But they have little pretence to *Antiquity* for any of their *Theses*. These five Doctrines I have mentioned were never heard the least mention of till about St. *Augustine's* time, and as I said before, it was the heat and violence of opposing *Pelagius*, that produc'd those notions at that time. Thus the *Fathers* that disputed against *Arianism*, dropt several expressions that savour'd of *Sabellianism* : It was a furious zeal in confuting the errors of *Nestorius*, that begot the heresy of *Eutyches* : And our Reformation from

Papacy

Papacy
up a
them
other
St. A
three
Nev
Iren
drov
Presb
and
and
Bu
adver
prefer
prejud
up fo
course
again
dismin
which
which
ten th
word
Th
Confe
even
Magi
was
Comp
ver ca
than t
John
on, t
people
nay,
Coven
ars an
unsett
to be

Papacy brought on *Presbytery*. When men set themselves up against a doctrine, many times the heat of zeal carries them too far, and drives them into as great blunders on the other Hand. And this is all that can be said in defence of *St. Augustin*, *Prosper* and *Fulgentius*, who are the only three Fathers that but seem to favour the *Presbyterians*. Never word of *Cyprian*, or *Chrysostom*, or *Athanasius*, or *Irenæus*, &c. till *St. Augustine*, and some one or two, that drove down the stream of his reputation. And all the *Presbyterians* have to say against us, is to call us *Pelagians* and *Arminians*, as if it were only out of hatred to *Pelagius* and *Arminius*, that they maintain such novel doctrines.

But are epithets and bad names, arguments against an adversary? we give them no such odious titles, only represent them and their doctrines in a true light, and let unprejudic'd Christians judge of both. I might have open'd up some more of their doctrines to you, but this will of course fall in, when I defend the constitution of our Church against their accusations and objections. Only I cannot dismiss this head, without taking notice of two Instances in which they directly contradict their established doctrines, which will serve to let you see that nothing can bind or fasten them farther than suits their humour, or advances their wordly Interest.

The first instance I shall mention, is a doctrine in their *Confession of Faith*, which teaches, that no crime, not even *Infidelity* itself, can alienate the right that the supreme Magistrate has to our *Obedience*. Whether their meaning was conform to their expression, only *GOD* and the Compilers were Judges: I am sure, no expressions whatever can be stronger for *Passive Obedience* and *Non-resistance*, than these are. Indeed these Divines contradict the famous *John Knox* and *George Buchanan*, who both were of opinion, that Governours are not always to be obeyed, that the people may and ought to resist them, when they do wrong, nay, and to depose them too, if they persist. The first *Covenanters*, among whom were *Mr. Henderson* at *Leuchars* and *Mr. Dickson* at *Irvin*, leading men, were a little unsettled in this point, and look'd on this case of allegiance to be very full of rocks and thorns, and would fain have been producing

Producing the authority of reformed Divines to countenance the doctrines of *Buchanan* and *Knox*. But all the *Protestant Churches*, except themselves, were unanimous in defending the Sovereign, and *not-to-be resisted* authority of *Princes*. The famous Dr. *Rivet*, in his *Jesuita vapulans*, says, *that altho' some of the Scotch Reformers* (and he names *Buchanan* and *Knox*) *maintain'd the lawfulness of subjects opposing their Magistrates even in cases of necessity, yet all Protestants condemn'd such doctrine*: And because a *Jesuit* took hold of that doctrine of *Buchanan's*, and boasted, that the *Scots Divines* were as great favourers of *Rebellion* as the Society of the *Jesuits*, *Rivet* says something in vindication of them, but at the same time confesses their doctrine to be erroneous. *Peter Martyr* is of the same mind with *Rivet* in his *Book of common Places*: As likewise are *Hugo Grotius*, *Leonard Hutterus*, *John Gherardus*, *Zepherus*, &c. and even *Calvin* himself in his *4th Book of Institutions* and last Chapter, where he concludes it utterly unlawful for private men to resist their *Prince*, and excepts none from the necessity of *Passive obedience*, but only *popular Magistrates*, such as the *Lacedæmonian Ephori*, the *Roman Tribunes*, and the *Athenian Demarchi*. This exception he makes to give some countenance to the practice of some of the reform'd churches at that time. But, when he comes to speak of the kingdoms, that now are, he is very uncertain on the point, and says, *Peradventure* the three estates assembled in parliament have that same power over kings that the *Lacedæmonian Ephori* had. But a *PERADVENTURE*, in a matter of such importance is but a slender warrant for a man's conscience. For he that resisteth a King by force of arms, should not only think that *PERADVENTURE* he has power so to do, but should be assuredly perswaded of it: When there is no more to say for a thing, but *PERADVENTURE* it is lawful, there is as much to say against it, that *PERADVENTURE* it is not lawful: And in such a doubt, a man's practice would needs be very cautious and guarded.

• The Church of Scotland in K. Charles I. time, were of this opinion too, that by no means may Subjects of whatever degree oppose their Sovereign's will, as appears by the Ministers

Ministers of *Aberdeen* their *Replies* and *Duplies* to the *Covenanters* on that head, in which they vindicate *Bilson* and *Whitaker*, two *English* Divines, from the charge of being of contrary sentiments. It seems the assembly of Divines at *Westminster* 1647 join'd with the whole current of *Catholick Antiquity* and with these foreign Protestants in expressing the necessity of *Passive Obedience*, and have taken care to declare their mind in the clearest, most distinct terms imaginable. But what I design'd to observe is, how well their practices have quadrate with this doctrine, and to prove this, the histories of K. *Charles* the II. and K. *James* VII. afford sufficient demonstrations. Their insurrections at *Pentland-Hills* and *Bothwel-Brigs*, their violent setting up of the *Covenant* in defiance of royal prohibition, their murder of Archbishop *Sharp*, their behaviour at the memorable *Revolution*; these are glaring instances how little they regard their own doctrines, which they are bound, some by oaths some by subscriptions, to observe, how little they regard even these, when they seem to contradict their other Projects. This is an instance, in which they practised wrong, contrary to a right doctrine. I shall produce another instance in which they practise well, tho' their doctrine be bad: And that is their *Solemn League and Covenant*, which was begun in 1638, in defence as they pretended of the true *reformed Religion*. By this *Covenant* they are bound and engaged in the most sacred manner, 'to endeavour, to the utmost of their power, to purge out of this national Church all *Popery* and *Prelacy*, that is, the government of the church by *Archbishops*, *Bishops*, &c. and this to do against all opponents whatever, and without respect of persons: And not to suffer themselves by whatsoever combination, perswasion, or terror, to be divided or withdrawn from this blessed union, whether to make defection to the contrary part, or to give themselves to a detestable *Indifference* and *Neutrality* in this cause: But to continue therein zealously and constantly all their days, and to promote the same against all lets and impediments:" And all this they are by covenant sworn to do in *England* as well as in *Scotland*, *That the LORD may be one, and his Name one in these Kingdoms*.

As

As to the lawfulness and unlawfulness of this *Covenant*, is not my business: Let Lawyers and Canonists decide that point. Only let us see how well they have observed it. The *Covenant*, as then taken, was declar'd to be binding on all their Posterity, and I never yet heard of the *Presbyterians* renouncing it. It was but once propos'd to them in the Reign of K. *Charles* the II. and they then begg'd to be excus'd. If they have renounced it since, they have done it in secret, which none of them I dare say, will acknowledge. Now if the *Presbyterians* be still under the obligation of this *Covenant*, as the most of them boast they are, why do they not endeavour to suppress *Popery* and *Prelacy* in *England* as they have done in *Scotland*? Why do they not endeavour this, as they are bound by the terms of the *Covenant*, against all opponents even against King *George* himself? Why are they brought over to such a detestable *Neutrality* and *Indifferency* in this important cause? Why do they not study to the utmost of their Power to remove all letts and impediments whatever, all the statutes and acts of *Parliament* that have established *Prelacy* in *England*? Can they say, that, till they do this, that the LORD is one and his Name one in both these Kingdoms? Yet so far are they from walking up to the obligations of the *Covenant*, that instead of fighting against K. *George*, as the *Covenant* has them sworn to do, they have taken an *Oath of Allegiance* to him; and promised to defend him, (and that too in defence of *Prelacy*, which by law he is bound to support in *England*) against all opponents? If they acted conform to the *Covenant*, they are engaged to carry fire and sword into *England*, and take up arms against K. *George*, till he abolish *Episcopacy*, and settle CHRIST's *Kirk*, as their forefathers serv'd his Predecessor K. *Charles* the I. This is what the *Covenant* has them sworn to, and till they discharge this *Covenant*-oath, I cannot see, how they can call themselves honest men, or be freed even from the dreadful charge of Perjury. Not that I condemn their peaceable practice in this case, or would be for their rising up in arms for their abolishing *Prelacy*: Far from it, But 'tis to shew you what kind of Spirits they are, which nothing can fasten nor fix. If they say, that the *Covenant* is not binding now, they disown themselves from being the followers

followers of these godly *covenanted* Saints, and so are a new upstart sect of creatures without either father or mother: Or if they say, that part of the *Covenant* was sinful, why do they not testify so much, and make publick Repentance for all the miseries and calamities, which it has brought upon the nation? But this is what none of them will say: They all own themselves the disciples, the posterity of these zealous *Antiprelatical Reformers*: And some of them I know, that in their publick prayers give thanks to *G O D* for their being a covenanted nation, and inveigh bitterly against the indifferency and lukewarmness of the present age, in not discharging their *Covenant-oaths*. *inveigh*

Any Government may see, what good subjects men of such principles are, and how far they are to be trusted: No farther, to be sure, than they have power to execute their designs: And never was a time, when their power was greater: Never since the confusion of the civil wars in *K. Charles's* time about a 100 years ago, when the whole management of the kingdom was in their hands, and now they have no Rival, or opposite party to ballance them. They are foster'd and encourag'd by the present *Administration*: The *Episcopal* party, by their interest, is quite suppress'd in this Kingdom: and there is no lett or impediment in their way to hinder the abolishing of *Episcopacy* in *England*, but a standing army, which, they fear, they are not able to cope with. Yet if they were as sensible of the obligation of the *Covenant*, as the first *Covenanters* were, their zeal might find out a method for performing the oath, and putting their designs in execution. But they find it their interest to submit quietly to this *Government*, and to forget all *Oaths* and *Covenants* and *Leagues* for some time. If the present *Administration* should be pleas'd to restore *Episcopacy*, or but ventur'd to mortify the *Presbyterians* any manner of way, the world would soon see the sleeping *Covenant* awaken'd, and all it's dormant obligations recover their former strength. Let us now in the

3^d Place consider the *Presbyterian* way of *Worship*, which as ridiculous and disagreeable as it is, is the principal point of temptation to you, and the only thing, as you own your selves, that has any weight with you to hear them.

But

But my bretheren, what do you hear with them? Do you hear any chapter of the *Bible*, except it be a small portion of one to lecture upon? No, you must confess, and you care not: You can do that at home. Do you hear any of the *Psalms*, these admirable pieces of divine devotion, read? No, you can read them at home. Do you hear the *Commandments* read, thereby to keep them in your minds? No, you have these at home too. Do you hear the *Apostles Creed*, which is so necessary for every Christian, that can, to know and believe? Or do you so much as hear the *Lord's Prayer*, that great help for all your defects and weaknesse in this excellent duty of Prayer? Neither of these you hear so much as mentioned. Will you tell me then, what do you hear? Why you hear a thing call'd an *Extempore* Prayer, where the Minister speaks a great many good sweet words with as many pious coughs and groans intersperst here and there, to draw out his performance to some length, and when he has done, you cannot tell what he has been saying. This is your darling, what you are so bewitch'd with, and run so madly after. For shame my Brethren, to be so infatuate with such a medley of blunders and nonsense and blasphemy as these productions are very often stuff'd with: to despise a Worship where the Prayers are soberly and piously compos'd, where you know what it is the minister and yourselves are praying for, where the *Scriptures* and *Psalms* are orderly read for your instruction, where you every day hear the whole of your duty to GOD and your Neighbour read before you, and where you are called on to declare your belief in the *Fundamental* points of our *Christian Faith*, to despise such a *Worship* for one or two or three unthought of pieces of prayer, where you can neither join your part, nor well understand what the performer would be at, this shows a spirit, which I cannot tell what to call it, if it be not a spirit of *giddiness* and *stupidity*. Yet this is what some of our Members have already gone over to: Men that have no relish of any thing unless it affect their passions, and set them a sighing and groaning, in which they foolishly think the whole of devotion consists. Such men are to be found among us, who even in our sunshine days exprest but little regard for the Prayers of the *Church*, and had no religious motive

motive that I know of for coming up to our Assemblies : And these men are now discover'd in this trying time, by starting off from us, and going into a flourishing schism, where they find their temporal concerns will be in no danger. Yet I persuade myself, the greatest part of you do still entertain such a veneration for the Church, even in its distress, as will be proof against all temptations to desert her.

§ III.

IT remains now that I answer all the objections and cavils which our *Presbyterian* Neighbours can muster up against us, as it is but reasonable, after having shewn you what is wrong, to settle and confirm you in what is right. The

1st. Grand objection they have against our *Constitution* is the Government of the church by *Bishops*. This they disdainfully call *Prelacy*, a corrupt shred of *Popery*, *Antichristian Heirarchy*, and a great many more odious titles, to render it the more vile and contemptible in the eyes of the common people. In their present sermons indeed while they bitterly rail at us for other things, they forget the old quarrel of *Episcopacy*, and seem to have no grudge at us upon that score. The reason of this is visible: Whatever ill will they may bear to the *Scottish Bishops*, it would be imprudent at this critical juncture, to disoblige the *Bishops* in *England*, by inveighing publicly against their whole order, and treating them, as they used to do, with ignominy and contempt. This is another instance what time serving spirits they are, and how cunningly they can go to work, as circumstances and occurrences vary. But as we know very well, that the old malice and enmity at this *Venerable* institution is still lurking in their breasts, and that they wait but for a convenient opportunity to exert it ; I shall let you see by undoubted authorities, that this model of *Church Government* is exactly agreeable to *Scripture*, to *Antiquity*, and even to the first plan of *Reformation* in *Scotland*, notwithstanding all the clamours that our Adversaries raise to the contrary. Now,

As a preliminary article, it must, and will, I presume, be granted, that as the *Christian Church* is a distinct visi-

ble *Society*, so it must, like all other *Societies*, have distinct visible *Officers* in it, separated from the rest of the members, and set apart for performing certain sacred functions appropriate to this spiritual *Society*. This, I say, the *Presbyterians* do readily grant. The Question betwixt us and them is, whether among these *Church Officers* there should be, according to their primitive institution, any kind of subordination and dependence, or whether they were all appointed on an equal footing, without the least superiority one over another? This is the state of the question: The *Presbyterians* say, all *Church Officers* should be equal: We differ from them, and maintain, that there are different degrees and orders among the *Officers of Christ's Church*; and this assertion of ours, as I proceed, I shall make clear from *SCRIPTURE*, which is as full upon this point, as is needful for vindicating our Practice. While our blessed *LORD* himself was personally present upon earth; no body will scruple to call him the Governour, or supreme head, or chief *Bishop* of the *Church*: Neither can it be deny'd, that he had *Inferiour Officers* under him: And these too of two sorts: The one call'd *Apostles* and the other *Disciples*: The *Disciples* being inferiour to the *Apostles* and both of them inferior to *CHRIST*: This is plain from the different method of their several *Ordinations*. Before the inauguration of the *Apostles* into their *Office*, our *Lord* commanded his *Disciples*, *St. Matt. ix. 35.* to pray to *GOD* to send labourers into his *Harvest*, and likewise continued all night in prayer by himself, *St. Luke i. 12.* which we have no mention of in the ordination of the inferiour *Disciples*, *St. Luke x. 1.* The first were likewise distinguished by the name of *Apostles* the other seventy were only call'd by the general name of *Disciples*. The twelve *Apostles* were appointed to be constant attendants on our *LORD*, and thus they are described both from their ordination, till they were sent forth to preach, and again after their return from preaching, till his ascension. The seventy were only appointed to preach, and after they return'd to our *LORD* and gave an account of their success in the execution of their office, they are never once mentioned again. The *Apostles* were the only persons, that received the Commission to Commemorate the sacrifice of the

LORD'S

LORD's *Body on the Cross*, and to *Preach the gospel to all nations*. When a vacancy happned in the College of the *Apostles* by the apostacy and miserable end of *Judas*, another was in a most solemn manner by divine designation appointed to take his *Bishoprick*: And *Matthias*, the person ordain'd to succeed *Judas*, if we may credit the testimonies of *Eusebius*, *Jerom*, and *Epiphanius*, was one of the seventy. From this we clearly see, that the *Seventy Disciples* were by their commission *Church Officers*, and yet were in many important Points inferiour to the *Apostles*, and this too, even while our blessed SAVIOUR lived on earth: And this Plan of *Church Government*, as the *Fathers* tell us, our LORD took from that, which he had before established in the *Jewish Church*, which, as we read in the Bible, was govern'd by one *High Priest*, and by *Priests* and *Levites* in subjection to him. But at his death he thought fit to erect a model which should take in all nations, and which might serve the exigences of his *Church*, as long as his *Church* was to continue, and that was forever. Accordingly, when he was to leave the world, we find him enlarging the Power of the *Apostles*, and granting them a fuller and more extensive commission. At their first *Ordination*, they got power only to preach and baptize, the very lowest degree of ministerial function: And by this *Commission* they were ordain'd *Deacons*, which is the lowest order of *Church Ministers*, and in primitive times, as now, were only allow'd to preach and baptize. After this they received authority to commemorate our LORD's Sacrifice, when he commanded them at his last supper, St. *Luke* xxii. 19: *to do as he had done*, that is, *to bless the elements of Bread and Wine in remembrance of him*. At this time they were ordain'd *Presbyters*, this office having been constantly perform'd by the *Presbyters*, or second order of Ministers: At last they were ordain'd *Bishops*, and received the whole plenitude of *Church Power* that our SAVIOUR himself, as supreme *Bishop* of the *Church*, had received from GOD: *As my father hath sent me*, saith he, *so send I you*, St. *John* xx. 21. and when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost*. Thus you see the *Apostles* received not all their Power at once, as the *Presbyterians*

Byterians now do, but at three different times, and, as we might say, by three different portions. And this *Episcopal* power, which was last of all conferred upon them, was more extensive, than the branches of Power, which they had before received. This *Episcopal Power* we find them, after our *Saviour's Ascension*, beginning to exercise in several instances. They ordain, by mutual consent and by the election of the *Holy Ghost*, one to fill up the place of the traitor *Judas*, and prescribe several rites to be observed by their several *Church Assemblies*: But the first remarkable exercise of their *Episcopal* power, is their ordaining the order of *Deacons* to answer the needs and necessities of the *Church*: who from the nature of their office, because they were principally design'd to serve the *Bishops*, were called *Deacons*, a Greek word which signifies *Servants*. This order they instituted in imitation of our blessed *LORD's* example, who, as we have already seen, first ordain'd themselves *Deacons* to serve and attend upon him. And the terms of their office were like the powers with which our *LORD* at first endued the *Apostles*: They had power to preach the gospel, and to baptize such as should be converted to the *Christain faith*. This was the *Deacons* business, and farther than this they could not go. They could neither administer the Sacrament of the *LORD's* Supper, nor give absolution to the People, They could only preach and baptize. Thus we find *Philip*, who was one of them, baptizing the *Eunuch*, which we may be sure he would not have past unquarrelled for, if he had not power to do it. And *Stephen*, who was another of them, is recorded to have been a Man full of the *Holy Ghost*, and to have drawn on himself the hatred of the *Jews* for his admirable eloquence in preaching.

This order of *Deacons*, according to their primitive establishment, is preserved in our Church to this day, and tho', by reason of its low circumstances, every thing that pertains to the decorum of a *Church* cannot be kept up, yet this is retain'd among us, as being a necessary part of the *Church Constitution*: and the office of *Deacons* made the first step for ascending to the higher orders of the *Clergy*. I would ask the *Presbyterians*, where their

Deacons

Deacons are, if they have any ? If they pretend to observe this *Apostolic Institution*, let them only shew us their *Deacons*, and shew us at the same time, if their *Deacons* have the same Power, that the Apostles *Deacons* had. But, if they say they have no *Deacons*, I hope they'll give you some reasonable Excuse for it. I know their reason : They will tell us, there is now no necessity for them, and that they were only ordain'd at first to continue for a time, as long as the Church needed them. They may tell us, as well, that the *observation of the LORD's Day* was only to continue for a time, or the *baptizing of Infants*, or any *Apostolic Institution* only to continue for a time. This I say, they may tell, but they cannot prove. We can tell them and prove it too, that the Office of a *Deacon* continued in the Church from one generation to another, and there is not a *Council* or *Synod*, of the *primitive Fathers*, but what mention is made of *Deacons*, and their powers confirmed, and their duties explained, what they are to do. St. Paul seldom travelled without a *Deacon*, sometimes he had Mark sometimes Timothy, but was rarely without one or other, as the history of the *Acts* tells us. The great St. Athanasius, whom perhaps the *Presbyterian* Doctors think nothing of, was a *Deacon*, when the famous council of Nice was held, and as a *Deacon* he attended on his Bishop, Alexander, who was then Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt. And Church histories give us account of many *Deacons* by name from time to time, that were men remarkable for their learning, for their constancy in the profession of their faith, and for their diligence in executing their office. We may put it upon the *Presbyterians* therefore, either to account for their throwing aside this office, or to let us see where their Church has provided for the continuation of it : And unless they can do either of these, they must own, that the *Constitution* of their *Kirk* is so far defective and lame.

The next order of *Ministers* in our Church is that of *Presbyters* or *Elders*, corresponding to the *Priests* among the *Jews* : But I shall say little of this order, because our Adversaries own it to be of *Apostolic Institution*, and allow all the arguments we can produce about them. Only I would

would mind you to observe that wherever there is word of an *Elder* and a *Deacon* together, the *Elder* is described as superior in rank to the *Deacon*. Thus *Paul* and *Silvanus* and *Timotheus*. 2 *Cor.* i. 19. This *Silvanus*, or *Silas*, was a *Prophet* or *Presbyter*, and next to the order of the *Apostles*: *Timotheus* was of an inferior order, for in all *St. Paul's* travels he ministered unto him as a *Deacon*: And all along throughout the *Acts*, *Paul* and *Silvanus* are described as principals in planting the Churches. Thus *Paul* and *Silas* only were apprehended at *Phillipi*, tho' *Timothy* was then in their Company, the fury of the rabble did not touch him as being but an inferior Minister. In the next Chapter *Acts* xvii. 14. we find them all three mentioned together, yet the Disciples at *Thessalonica* consoled only with *Paul* and *Silas*, and afterwards *Paul* and *Silas* are sent away by night without any word of *Timothy* tho' he was among them. Which I think, is a sure sign that *Silas* by virtue of his office of *Prophet* or *Presbyter*, was superior to *Timothy*, who was but a *Deacon*. Let the *Presbyterians* shew us their *Presbyters* or *Elders*: They'll tell you their *Kirk-Session* is made up of *Elders*, and these *Elders* are men chosen out from the body of the people by their *Minister* (or *Bishop*) to assist him in matters of *Church-discipline* without any vestige of that authority and power, which the *Elders* of the Church exercised in the *Apostles* days. They can neither preach nor baptize, nor perform any sacred function, and, instead of being superior to *Deacons*, as I have shewn the primitive *Elders* were, they are in every respect inferior to them. And will we say, that *St. Paul* would have paid so much respect to *Silvanus*, if he had been but one of our *Presbyterian* Lay-Elders, as to have directed his letters in his name as well as in his own? Besides what service could *Silvanus* have done *St. Paul*, if he could neither have preach'd nor pray'd, nor assisted him in the Administration of any Sacrament, which our *Presbyterians* must confess their elders are not allowed to do. In short 'tis as clear as the Day, that the *Scripture-Elders* were different from the *Presbyterian-Elders*, and had the same powers, neither more nor less, than the *Presbyters* of our Church have at this day.

But

But the principal grievance, which these men complain of, is the superiority of *Bishops* above *Presbyters*, a thing which, say they, is contrary to Scripture, contrary to the *primitive institution*, and contrary to the well being of the Church. These are big sounding accusations : But let us see what truth or solidity is in them, and how far the *Presbyterian* Charge against *Episcopacy* is just. Now,

By a *Bishop* of a church I mean that person, on whom the administration of church ordinances in that church depends, to whom all his *Presbyters* (or Elders) are accountable, and from whom alone they receive commission to act as his deputies under him : This *Bishop* is under CHRIST the head of his own particular *Church*, that is of that particular part of the one *Catholic Church* entrusted to his care, he is the principle of unity and communion in it ; he stands in capacity as it were of CHRIST's *Proxy*, by whom his *Church* is espoused to CHRIST it's LORD and husband. And whoever he be whether *Clergy-man* or *Lay-man*, that either willingly separates from his *Bishop* without lawful reasons, or is justly thrown out by his *Bishop's Authority*, is therefore cut off from the body of CHRIST. The *Bishop* then is the same director of that part of the *Church*, over which he presides, and we, that are only *Presbyters*, are to be obedient unto him in every thing, as unto CHRIST, to give him account of the discharge of our office, and to receive from him such counsels and orders, as he shall see necessary for better answering the exigences of the *Church*. Such a person therefore, as a *Bishop* is among us, the *Presbyterians* have not among them : They have none that can of himself confer orders, or excommunicate offenders, or depose disobedient *Ministers*. None, I say, that can do this of himself : This is referr'd to the confused voices of a multitude, and every thing that tends to the regulation, discipline and decency of a *Church* must depend on the majority of votes. This *Scheme*, say they, is more agreeable to *Scripture*, and to the *Practice of the Apostles*, than what the ambition and *Lordship* of one aspiring *Bishop* is. But, to any one that will read the *Scriptures*, it will appear that the *Apostles*, even as to their ordinary authority, were a good deal superior to our *Presbyterian Ministers* now. The power

power of sending forth more and more labourers into GOD's vineyard was given to them all in general and to every one of them in particular. The *Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven* were given not only to a *Presbytery*, or *Synod*, or *General Assembly* of them, but to every single *Man* among them: And *St. Peter* or *St. Paul* had as much power of themselves by virtue of the power, that *CHRIST* gave them, when they were removed and all alone in any distant province, as when they sat and voted in a full council of them at *Jerusalem*. The first single man, whom we read of in Scripture, under the Character, and exercising the authority of a *Bishop*, is *St. James*, whom some call the son of *Alpheus*, others the son of *Joseph*, but all conclude to have been our *LORD's* Kinsman. Whether this was done by our *LORD's* express order, when he appear'd to *James*, apart from the rest, after his resurrection *1 Cor. xv. 17.* or if it was done by the free election of the *Apostles*, is somewhat uncertain. However it is constantly affirm'd by the earliest *Father's* that he was the first *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, and in all the catalogues of the *Bishops* of that place, he is placed at the head of them. And tho' the Scriptures do not expressly mention his promotion, yet they give us many undeniable proofs of his being the *Head* of that *Church*. In the first 5 Chapters of the *Acts*, *St. Peter* is spoken of, as if he were the principal person; but from the 12th Chapter *St. James* is still mention'd as the chief person, even when *St. Peter* was present. When *St. Peter* was delivered out of the prison by the Angel, *Acts xii. 7.* he desired some of the disciples *ver. 17.* to shew what had befallen him to *St. James*, as the head of the *Church*, and the *Brethren* that is, the rest of the *Church*. *St. James* exerted his *Episcopal* power very visibly and manifestly in that famous *Synod* which was held at *Jerusalem* about the grand question, whether the *Gentiles* should be circumcised, as the history of it is set down at large *Acts xv.* *St. Peter* himself was there, and delivers his opinion as a private member of the meeting: *St. Paul* and *St. Barnabas* did the same, and there were great disputings in the *Council*. But *St. James* speaks with a decisive authority, " *Men and Brethren, hearken*

unto

unto
them
tence
riv'd
count
Gover
unto
all the
Jame
John
to be
Jerus
All w
Episc
ver th
Th
to be
have a
on th
he wa
most
xii. w
went
after,
Jerus
stitut
Minis
only h
had a
multi
that u
3000
increa
mong
have
Jame
this is
at a
nister
tants

unto me," and after he had given them his reasons, he tells them, " Wherefore my SENTENCE is : " And this sentence of his determines the point. When St. *Paul* arriv'd at *Jerusalem* from preaching the gospel to foreign countries *Acts* 21. 18. (tho' in other places he call'd the *Governors* of the *Church* to himself) yet there he goes in unto St. *James* to give him an account of his success, and all the elders (or *Presbyters*) were present. The name of St. *James* is plac'd by St. *Paul* first before St. *Peter* and St. *John* Gal. ii. 9. *James* and *Cephas* and *John* who seem'd to be pillars. And Gal. ii. 12. some of the church at *Jerusalem* are said to be, certain who came from *James*. All which put together are a strong demonstration of the *Episcopal* authority, with which St. *James* was invested over the *Church* of *Jerusalem*.

The *Presbyterians*, to invalidate all this, will have him to be only a common *Parish-Minister*, but allow him to have acted in all these passages as *Moderator*. Now, upon this supposition, the history of the *Acts* shews us that he was a constant *Moderator*, which differs in nothing almost from a *Bishop* : The first time he is mention'd *Acts*, xii. was in the year of our Lord 44, and when St. *Paul* went in to him, *Acts* xxii. it was in the year 60 full 16 years after, all which time he acted as *Moderator of the Synod of Jerusalem*, a thing quite contrary to the *Presbyterian Constitution*. But, if St. *James* was only a common *Parish-Minister*, and the *Elders*, that are spoken of with him, were only his *Kirk-Session*, (as the *Presbyterians* say) indeed he had a congregation of a vast extent : Besides the vast multitudes of believers in our *Saviour's* days, we find that upon the day of *Pentecost*, *Acts* ii. 41. there were 3000 souls added to them, and these numbers were still increasing by the labour and diligence of the *Apostles* among them : So that, allowing their whole number to have been 7 or 8000 christians in *Jerusalem*, when St. *James* was appointed their SUPREME MINISTER, (and this is what the *Presbyterians* will not deny) they will be at a loss to tell, how any one man could be able to administer *Church-ordinances* to so many without necessary assistants : According to the present calculation of allowing

1000 Souls to every single *Minister's* Cure, there would have been in *Jerusalem* at this time seven or eight such Cures, and at least as many *Presbyters* over whom *St. James* was *Bishop*, in the modern sense of the word: And even granting this to be but a supposition, 'tis much more probable, than the *Presbyterian* supposition that *St. James* was *Parish-Minister* to these 7 or 8000 Souls, and the *Elders* mention'd with him were only his unordained *Kirk-Session*.

From *St. James*, who, we see, was *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, in the same sense that ever any man was *Bishop* of *Aberdeen*, I proceed to take notice of *Timothy* the first *Bishop* of *Ephesus*: By his authority, as *Bishop*, he ruled the whole church of *Ephesus*, Ministers as well as private christians: He was empowered to command and teach those under his care: To make rules for the orderly celebration of divine worship: To hinder women from speaking in the publick assemblies: To see that those that were teachers under him should teach no doctrine but what they had received from the LORD and his *Apostles*: To commit the doctrine of the *Gospel* to faithful men, who might be able to teach others: To ordain for inferior *Church-Officers* such as he should find qualify'd: To take care, that a competent maintenance and due honour be paid to *Church-Ministers*: To take cognizance of all accusations, that might be lodg'd against the *Clergy*, and to censure the guilty according to the nature of the crime: And all this he had power to do of himself, not as our *Presbyterian Moderators* exercise their power by collecting the plurality of votes, but by an *Episcopal* power lodged in his own person. Had he been but *Moderator*, what power had *St. Paul* to leave him at *Ephesus*, *1 Tim. iv. 13.* in that quality, and to fix a constant *Moderator*, on the *Ephesian Elders*, who by the *Presbyterian* Scheme were priviledged to chuse their *Moderator* and to change him by turns.

Besides, say they, if *Timothy* was a *Bishop*, it was by *Presbyterian* ordination, *1 Tim. 4. 14.* Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the *Presbytery*: But what does this make for them? What should hinder this passage being

being applicable to *Timothy's* being ordain'd *Presbyter*, as there is no improbability but *St. Paul* had, with the concurrence and consents of the *Elders* of *Ephesus*, ordain'd *Timothy* into their number? At which ordination, as is usual now, *St Paul* as *Bishop*, might have allow'd the elders to lay on their Hands too: Especially as it is express with the hands of the *Presbytery*, not by the laying on of their hands, only with their concurrence and approbation. But I scarce think this place makes for *Presbyterian* ordination, since the *Presbyterians* will not say, that every one of their *Ministers* is ordain'd by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the *Presbytery*: And what will they say of that other place where he is said to receive the gift of *GOD* by the putting on of *St. Paul's* hands, without any mention of the *Presbytery*. It should seem *St. Paul* here assumes very much to himself, when he takes the whole power of *Ordination* into his own hands: It is more likely, that these two passages are to be differently applied, the first to the time, when *Timothy* was ordain'd *Presbyter*, in which the *Presbytery* or neighbouring *Elders* might have assisted, as they do at this day, and the second to the time that he was ordain'd *Bishop*, which *St. Paul*, by his apostolick power, was sufficient to do of himself. Yet whether this may pass for an argument or not, let the *Presbyterians* produce both the passages, and what the first passage gives them, the second as peremptorily takes from them: So much is plain, what *Timothy* had power to do by the imposition of *St. Paul's* hands, is a great deal above what any *Presbyterian Minister*, even their *Moderators* themselves, dare do: But as a *Bishop*, it justly belong'd to him: Accordingly he is always reckon'd the first *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, and about 450 years after *CHRIST*, at the general Council of *Chalcedon*, there had been 27 *Bishops* in *Ephesus* all deriving their succession in a direct line from *Timothy*. The same authority that *Timothy* had at *Ephesus*, *Titus* had at *Crete*, being left there by *St. Paul* to ordain *Elders* in every City, and to set in order whatever *St. Paul* had left wanting.

Nor are these the only examples that are to be met with in Scripture of *Bishops*, or single persons clad with the authority

authority of modern *Bishops*. St. *John*, in the 3 first chapters of his *Revelation*, gives us a particular description of seven *Bishops*, who presided in the seven principal cities of *Asia*, by introducing our LORD directing epistles to the *seven Angels of these seven Churches*. Some of the *Presbyterians* would maintain, that by these seven *Angels* is meant the whole body of christians in their respective churches: But *Beza*, *Faræus*, *Bullinger*, *Marlorat*, and others of the foreign *Presbyterians*, interpret the word *Angel* to signify the *Bishop* or chief governor of every church, as *Irenæus*, *Polycrates*, *Augustin*, *Ambrose*, and almost all the *Fathers*, had done before them. Some of these *Fathers* have given us the names of these seven *Bishops*: *Onesimus* Bishop of *Ephesus* after *Timothy*'s death, *Sagaris* or *Segasis* Bishop of *Laodicea*, *Melito* of *Sardis*, *Gaius* of *Pergamus* after *Antipās*'s death, *Carpus* of *Thyatira*, the famous *Polycarp* in *Smyrna*, and a *Bishop* too in *Philadelphia* whose name is not known. There you see upwards of ten instances of *Bishops*, or single men vested with *Episcopal* power even in Scripture: Let the *Presbyterians* adduce as many and as clear instances for their cause, if they would have you to believe them. If we take a view of the ages of christianity next to the *Apostolick* age, we shall find *Bishops* shining in great splendor. But the *Presbyterians* save me the trouble of particularizing, because they readily acknowledge, that the order of *Bishops* was to be found very early in the church: Only, say they, the *Apostles* were all equal, and in their days the christian church was govern'd by *Ministers* that were all equal, and none of them had any jurisdiction over another: "But
 " when pride and ambition prevail'd, when one said he
 " was of *Paul*, and another of *Apollos*, and another of
 " *Cephas*, then it was universally agreed, all over the
 " world, that out of the College of *Presbyters* one should
 " be chosen to preside over and govern the rest, and this
 " presiding *Presbyter* was called the *Bishop*." This is the great foundation of the *Presbyterian* cause, and for this they are indebted to St. *Jerom*: Even in this way they should confess, that *Episcopacy*, if not of divine institution, is very convenient for church decency, and for preventing
 pride

pride and ambition, &c. which, I dare say, the modern *Presbyterians* will not allow: Their famous *Blondel* dates this great change from the year of our LORD 135, and grants, that ever after the church was govern'd by *Bishops*, superior to *Presbyters*. But 'tis strange that such a general thing should have happened, as they say this change was, and and yet we should never had word of it but from them. If such a famous alteration had been made, would not some grave historian or other have told us of it, and might we not have heard of it from the like of *Tertullian* or *Origen*, men that could have known the truth of it, and would have faithfully deliver'd it, if it had been true? From such as them, I say, as well as from the *Presbyterians*, and that no farther back than 100 years ago or so, and all founded on a misinterpreted passage of one single *Father*, in which he goes against all antiquity, and even contradicts himself? Besides, If CHRIST and his *Apostles* had appointed, that all his *Church Ministers* should be on an equal footing, and had settled *Presbytery*, as the *Presbyterians* give out, by DIVINE RIGHT, how could all the church of CHRIST have taken on them to abolish CHRIST's institution, and new model it into what shape they pleased? Was there not so much as one single *Presbyter*, so honest and sincere, as to stand up in defence of *Christ's* appointment, and at least to enter his *Protest* against the removing *Presbytery* and settling *Episcopacy*, especially, if he believed, as the *Presbyterians* do now, that *Presbytery* was by divine right, and *Episcopacy* only an *Innovation*? It is universally believed, that the *Apostle* St. *John* lived till the 98 year after our LORD, in which case there are but seven and thirty years betwixt his death and the time, which *Blondel* would fix for beginning *Episcopacy*: And so, at that time, a man of sixty years of age might have been personally acquainted with that *Apostle*: Could not such a man have known, whether *Presbytery* was the *Apostolick Institution* or not? And if it had, would St *John's* disciples have patiently looked on, and seen the *Constitution* of the Church overturn'd so soon, and so universally too: This is what, I am sure, no man will believe, but he who is willing to be deceived.

There

There was never any remarkable *Revolution* in the world, but what we have some record or other of : *Revolutions* more antient than the Christian Church itself : And is it not strange we have no record of this ? We have the names of *Bishops* that liv'd about the time of this supposed alteration : We have *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Irenæus*, *Polycrates*, and great numbers more : It is certainly surprizing, we have an account of their names, but none of their usurpation.

We read of the Successions of the *Roman Emperors* about that time, and of the several changes and *Revolutions* that happned in the Empire, when the *Presbyterians* say this *Church Revolution* happen'd ; But no record of it : If they say, these Records were lost, I would know how they came by them ? Did never any of the primitive *Fathers* see them, before St. *Jerom* ? Or was he that liv'd about 300 years after this date, more diligent in searching out the truth, than his predecessors had been ? He was a very worthy man indeed : But was a man liable to Passions and Infirmities : And being but a *Presbyter* himself, and taking ill the ambition of some *Deacons* at that time, that took so much upon them, he exalts his own order as near as possible to an equality with the *Bishops*, and then produces this *universal decree* in his own defence. But let any Man consider how such an important thing could have happen'd and never any Writer of the Church taken notice of it, but only one : The truth is, *Episcopacy* is so antient, and has been so universally received, that St. *Augustine*'s unerring Rule proves it to be *Apostolical* : *Whatever Doctrine or Institution*, says that Father, *has universally prevailed in the Church, without any account of the particular beginning or rise it, we may conclude, such a doctrine or institution was certainly founded by the Apostles* : And if according to this rule, *Episcopacy* was founded by the *Apostles*, let the *Presbyterians* answer to the charge of calling it Antichristian.

On this footing, of *divine right*, *Episcopacy* kept its ground in the Church from the beginning to the present times, without any opposition : And in all Church Histories we never hear but of *three* that opposed it. The first

was

was *Aerius*, about the fourth century, who being disappointed of the Bishoprick of *Sabaſtia* in *Pontus*, where he was a *Preſbyter*, fell out heavily on the whole order of *Biſhops*, call'd them *Tyrants* over GOD's flock, and maintaining that they ſhould be turn'd out, and *Church Miniſters* reſtor'd to, what he call'd, their primitive equality. This was the firſt, that ever deſignedly impugned the *jus divinum* of the *Biſhops*. However, it ſtood this ſhock, and flouriſhed untouch'd till the *Popiſh Council* of *Trent*, about 200 years ago, attempted to rob *Episcopacy* of its divine right on purpoſe to complement the *Pope* with the whole power : And had it not been for the *French Biſhops* at that time, the *Pope's* Creatures had certainly carried their Point. This was the ſecond rub that *Episcopacy* got : And the third was, a very ſhort time after, that ſome of the *reformed Churches*, not only deny'd it to be a *Divine* inſtitution, but totally threw it off. The reformer's at *Geneva* and in *Switzerland* pretended neceſſity for this, and lamented that they could not be ſo happy as have a primitive *Episcopacy* ſettled among them. *Calvin* and *Beza*, theſe two cry'd up *Pillars of the Genevan Reformation*, not only commended *Episcopacy* in general and pleaded for the neceſſity of ſubmitting to it, but did highly extol the *Episcopal Hierarchy* of the *Church of England* in particular : *Beza* ſpeaking of the Government of the *English Church* by *Biſhops*, *Preſbyters* and *Deacons*, calls it a ſignal bleſſing of GOD, and wiſhes that *England* may ſtill enjoy it. How they can vindicate themſelves for laying aſide this venerable inſtitution, even upon their plea of pretended neceſſity, is none of my Buſineſs; They muſt answer for that themſelves. Even when the *Reformation* was begun here in *Scotland*, *Episcopacy* was kept up for ſome time : I ſhew'd you before, what *John Knox's* ſentiments of it were, and that *Biſhops* ſat and voted in the *Reformation-Parliament* : Some of them continued to exerciſe their *Episcopel* office, under the new name of *Superintendents*, and for twenty years after the *Reformation* began, there was no body dream'd of throwing *Episcopacy* altogether aſide : Indeed it was then trampled under foot, And what follow'd ? A medley of confuſion and diſorder: and whereas the poor people before

fore had only one tyrannous *Bishop*, as they were then call'd, in every principal City, they now had a tyrant in every *Country Parish*, and they had as much to fear from the *Presbyteries* and *Kirk-Sessions*, as before they had to fear from the *Bishops Courts*.

But that is generally seen, that nothing is altered in a hurry, but what something worse still follows: As violent speats and floods after they go off, leave a nasty scum behind them, so it happen'd by throwing off *Episcopacy*: In stead of the Superstitions of *Popery*, which only defac'd the Christian doctrines, the nation was overrun with the Prophana-tions of *Presbytry*, which struck at the very foundation of the *Church*: And notwithstanding the Circumstances that favour'd *Presbytery* then, it has met with many convulsions and overturns since, and tho' it has many times got itself thrust into Power, yet it has been many times set a packing again, and the primitive *jure divino Episcopacy* has to this day kept up his head amidst all the stormy billows of *Popery* and *Presbytery*, (the one like *Scylla*, the other like *Charybdis*) which for these two hundred years past, have been dashing against it.

Thus you see, from what I have said, what advantage we have over the *Presbyterians* for the sacred order of *Bishops*.

If they appeal to Scripture, even there we find *Episcopacy* begun, and founded by the inspir'd *Apostles* themselves. If they will be determin'd by *Antiquity*, by their own confession, we have all *Antiquity* for us without exception: If they venture, to plead their Numbers, even this will serve them nothing: What is the *Presbyterian Church* in *Scotland*, the *Dissenters* in *England*, the *Hugonots* in *France*, the *Calvinists* in *Geneva* and *Switzerland*, the *Mongrel Sectaries* in *Holland*, what are all these in comparison of the vast nations where *Episcopacy* is retain'd, and where the *Church* is govern'd by *Bishops*, independent of the *Bishop of Rome*. Yea let the *Presbyterians* take in the *Papists* with them, yet even they'll bear no proportion to the large Kingdoms that adhere to *Episcopacy*, and have either cast off, or were never under the Yoke of the *Pope's supremacy*. The Empire of *Russia* maintains *Episcopacy*:
There

There is *Sweden, Denmark, England, Ireland*, and the *Lutheran Churches in Germany*, these are far supernumerary to all the *Papists* and *Presbyterians* in the world. But then what will they think of the *Greek Church*, the *Indian Church*, the *Abissines in Ethiopia*, the *Cophites in Egypt*, the *Armenians* and other *Christian Churches* which retain *Episcopacy* according to the primitive institution, yet never own'd the supremacy of the *Roman See*, nor so much as once advanc'd the parity pleaded for by the *Presbyterians*. Let them, if they can, produce but one single Church in the wide Christian world, whose *Constitution* is not *Episcopal*, or who are not, and have not always been govern'd by *Bishops*, distinct from and superior to *Presbyters*, that is to say, any one *Presbyterian Church* before the Church of *Geneva*, from whence all the *Presbyterian doctrines* in this nation have been transplanted, not quite 200 years ago. If they can shew you any part of the world where *Presbytery* was established before, it would say something for their cause, and the honour of their cause calls on them to attempt it: But if they cannot, they should forever hold their peace. So much in vindication of *Episcopacy*.

2d. Another great Butt of *Presbyterian* malice is our *set forms of prayer*, which indeed they do not condemn as Anti-christian and against Scripture, but disparage them as inconvenient, as a stinting of the spirit, as an encouragement for laziness and the like. 'Tis very well they have nothing more to say against us on this score: If *set forms of Prayer* be not against Scripture, why should they be condemned? Every Church has Governours, and the Governours of any Church, may prescribe and settle every thing for the decency of the Church, as they shall see expedient, provided they prescribe nothing contrary to GOD's word. The Governours of the *Presbyterian Kirk*, such Governours as they have, have appointed *extempore Prayers*, as judging them most for the edification of the people: Why may not the Governours of our Church have the same liberty, for the same reason, to appoint *Set Forms*? But,

To discuss this Objection more fully, let us see whether *set Forms* have been of constant use in the Church, and if it appear that they have, there will be the less room for the

Presbyterians to say any thing against them. The *Jewish Church* perform'd their publick Worship by *Set Forms*, as appears from several passages in the old Testament, where we find some set forms of Prayer and praise on record: Such are *Exodus*, xv. 1. *Deuter.* xxi. 7. 1 *Chron.* xxiii. 30. *Nehem.* xii. 24. *Ezra* iii. 10, &c. And the truth of this has been fully shewn to the world by *Josephus*, *Philo* the Jew, *Paulus*, *Fagius*, *Scaliger*, *Buxtorfius*, and *Selden*. Dr. *Hammond* proves both that the *Jews* used set forms, and that they were much in the same order as our *common Prayer*. Dr. *Lightfoot* has carefully collected and set down the order and method of their Supplications. These forms of theirs were all very good, and differed in nothing from Christian prayers, but that they did not use, as we do the mediation of CHRIST: And Commentators, even of the reformed Religion, such as *Capellus*, &c. have observed, that our SAVIOUR'S *Form of Prayer* which he composed for the use of his Disciples, was mostly collected out of the *Euchologies*, or prayer books, of the *Jews*: And the very preface to the LORD'S prayer, *Our Father which art in Heaven*, was the usual preface of the Jewish prayers before: The learned *Grotius* has this reflexion upon this, " So far " was the LORD himself, of the *Christian Church*, from " all affectation of unnecessary novelty." This shews what regard our Saviour had to *set Forms* antiently received and approved by the Church of GOD: And this regard he testified by constantly frequenting the *Temple Worship* of the *Jews*, where *set Forms* were used: Which that he did, we may gather from this, that the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, his most inveterate enemies, never tax him with the neglect or contempt of *Publick Prayer*, as they would undoubtedly have done, if they had seen reason.

Conform to this practice of their LORD, the *Apostles*, for some time, attended on the stated hours of *Worship*, which they might well do, and not neglect the assembling of themselves together either. That they used the LORD'S Prayer in their own *Christian Assemblies*, no body will deny, that considers the stile of it, which seems to have been design'd for publick use: *Our father—give us—forgive us—deliver us*, &c. and is an indication that it was given to the Disciples

Disciples at their earnest request, as CHRIST's *peculiar Form*, to be a badge of their being his Disciples. The words of command with which our *Saviour* delivers this Prayer, St. *Matt.* vi. 9. St. *Luke* xi. 2. are as peremptory and strong, as his command to baptize all Nations, St. *Matt.* xxviii. 19. And if any man will allow himself to doubt whether the *Apostles* made use of the LORD's Prayer or not, he may as well doubt whether they baptized in the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, the one being as positive a command as the other.

Whether the *Apostles* had other *Set Forms* in their publick Worship besides this *Form* left them by our blessed LORD, or whether they pray'd extempore is not to be clearly deduced from Scripture : If they did pray extempore, they had sufficient capacity so to do, being immediately inspir'd by the *Holy Ghost* : And unless the *Presbyterians* will pretend to be thus inspir'd, which is a length none of them will go, or unless they can prove, that the *Apostles*, injoin'd *Extempore Prayers* to be the standing practice of the *Church*, unless they will do either of these, the *Apostles* example will not be found to be binding now for *extempore Prayers*, even allowing that they had made use of them, which no *Presbyterian* could ever yet make good. There is one consideration, which I think makes against the *Presbyterian* supposition, that the *Apostles* used *Extempore Prayer*, and it is this ; That if they did, it should seem strange how the very next Age would have disused them, and not paid the same regard to the *Apostles* example in that Point, as they did in other Points, especially since this gift of inspiration continued for some Ages in the Church. And that the next Ages to the age of the *Apostles*, had *Set Forms* in their publick Worship, is manifest from a Cloud of Witnesses, whose authority and testimony our adversaries, with all their fanatick fubility, could never yet subvert : Such as *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Cyril*, *Chrysostom*, *Optatus*, *Augustine*, *Gregory Nyssen* and many others : The *koinai euchai* or common Prayers, mentioned by *Justin Martyr*, were certainly different from the *Presbyterian extempore Prayers*, otherwise how could they be called common, and, as he tells us, how could all the people say *amen* to them, a thing which our adversaries allow

low not. What shall I say of all the antient *Liturgies*, or formulas of prayer now extant: Such as the *Clementine Liturgy*, the *Liturgy* of St. *Basil*, of St. *Chrysostom*, &c. and the antientest of all, the *Liturgy* of St. *James*, which, with the notes and corrections of the late learned Bishop *Rattray*, some of you have seen.

I know, our Enemies will and do object against the antiquity and genuineness of these *Liturgies*: Upon what grounds themselves could never tell, unless it be, according to the observation of *Hobbes*, *That when reason is against a man, a man will be against reason*. These *Liturgies* have been vindicated, both from *Presbyterian* contradictions and *Popish* interpolations, by many learned men of the *English Church*, and the famous *Presbyterian John Daille*, that has been at so much pains against the *Constitutions* and *Canons of the Apostles*, never once attack'd the *Liturgies*. But indeed, the very earliest accounts we have of Christianity are so full against the *Presbyterians* on this point, that 'tis no wonder, if they be reduc'd to a strait how to defend themselves. It would seem indeed, there had been some of their stamp beginning to introduce *extempore Prayers* into the Church about the end of the fourth Century. For in a Council held at *Melvois* in *Africa*, under the reigns of *Arcadius* and *Honorius*, it was decreed, That no Prayers should be made in the Church but such as were compos'd and approved in the *Council*: And the reason they give is, least happily any thing should, either through Ignorance or carelessness, be uttered contrary to the true Faith. And thus it continued in the Church, *Publick Worship* being perform'd in a liturgical way, after the method of our *Common Prayers*, the people being allowed their Parts in it, as indeed in reason they ought to have, till by degrees the *Church of Rome*, among other corruptions, began to take this Liberty from them by introducing prayers in an unknown tongue. By this means it far'd with the ignorant vulgar, as it does at this day with the *Presbyterians*: They had nothing to do, but to turn over Books of their own, or stand gazing on the *Minister*, who was now the sole performer.

I might

I might appeal to the *Presbyterians* themselves, if they had any ingenuity, whether they or we symbolize most with the *Papists* in this point; we who, according to the practice of the primitive times, allow the people to join in the *Publick Prayers* of the *Church*, or they who, in imitation of the *Papists*, give the whole glory of that sacred action to their Minister. At the *Reformation*, this abuse of the *Papists* was rectified: Prayers in an unknown tongue were laid aside, And the antient method of *Liturgies* in the mother language was restored.

In a meeting of the *Lords* of the *Congregation* anno 1558, it was ordain'd, says *Knox's* history, "that in all parishes of this realm the *Common prayer* be read weekly on *Sundays*, and other *Festival Days* publickly in the *parish Churches*, with the *Lessons* of the old and new *Testament*, conform'd to the order of the *Book of common Prayers*: And if the *Curate* of the *Parish* be qualified, to cause him to read the same." What can the *Presbyterians* say to this? Had any of our *Historians* written this, they might have questioned their veracity: But their great *Apostle* and *Oracle* *Mr. Knox*, when he gives an account so favourable to our cause, I hope, they have more regard for him than to endeavour to weaken this *Testimony*. Whether this was *K. Edward the VIth's Liturgy*, or the *Liturgy* of *Geneva*, it matters not, since 'tis plain it was a *Liturgy*: And even their other *Historian Calderwood* tells us, that on the 15th of *January* anno Mr. *Howy*, Principal of *St. Andrew's*, Drs. *Wederburn* and *Melvil* were directed by *Leters* in the *Kings* name to use the *English Liturgy* morning and evening, which was accordingly, says he, put in *Execution*. And in the *Preface* to the *Scots Liturgy*, compiled and published for the use of our *Church* here in 1637, we are told, that for divers years after the *Reformation* we had no other order for *Common Prayer*, but the *English Liturgy*.

That there was a *Liturgy*, or *Book of Common prayer* in *Geneva*, is what the *Presbyterians* dare not deny: *Knox* himself made use of *Set Forms*. In his history there is a form for electing *Superintendents* to their *Office*. The *Protestants* in *France* have forms of *Prayer* in their *publick Worship*: And I have a *French new Testament* by me,
in

in the end of which is a Form for administering the *Lord's Supper*, for the use of the *French Protestants*. In a word, except the *Presbyterians*, all the Christian world worships GOD in a liturgical way by *set Forms* and tho' they have now got their own fanciful method established, yet from the beginning it was not so. Now as *set Forms* of Prayer can plead both *Antiquity* and *Universality* in their own defence, so they are recommended by their decency and usefulness too. They are very necessary to prevent all Manner of levities and blunders in the *Publick Worship* of GOD, which certainly should be perform'd with the utmost gravity and decorum : And which has suffered very much by the ridiculous incoherencies and trivial clownish expressions with which very often these *Extempore Effusions* are stuffed. Neither is it reasonable, that every single *Minister*, in his Parish, should be trusted with the care and direction of holy things by the abilities of his own Brain: lest, which very often happens, some of the weaker sort among them may fall into error, or lead the people astray, by his mistake. Besides, what are Prayers design'd for, but for the benefit of the People, and what benefit can the people have by them, unless they be allowed to join in them? To see a multitude of people, in different postures and with different gestures, gazing on a man mounted aloft above them and admiring his motions and looks, and sometimes sighing at a *Sweet* expression, what does it resemble but some *theatrical Performance* upon a Stage? If a man comes into a Congregation where the *Minister* is left to pray as he pleases, how can he join with him in prayer, unless he has a foolish implicit faith in the person that prays? He cannot immediately direct his devotions to GOD, as he should do, but must take time to consider, whether the prayers of the *Minister* be such as he may safely join in. This inconvenience is remedy'd by the use of *set Forms*, that are provided before hand ; and which, it were well for Religion, if all Christians were acquainted with. In short, since we must use words in our prayers to GOD 'tis fit we should use the best and properest we can : And how is it possible that the sudden unpremeditate words of a man's tongue can be so proper to be presented to GOD, as words that

that
care
A
tha
exter
Spir
once
prom
If th
GH
teach
as un
ers t
over
the
will i
Unle
inspir
believ
xiv.
stand
rit,
with
using
rit, d
comp
nish
so ma
Pray
may b
gift
tho'
of ha
them,
Psal
insiste
their
while
morni
when

that have been deliberate on and approved by the judicious care of many learned men.

All that the *Presbyterians* have to say for themselves is, that how can a man pray with the *Spirit* unless he pray *extempore*? But what do they mean by praying with the *Spirit*? Is it that the HOLY GHOST inspires them all at once with words and expressions, and, as our SAVIOUR promis'd his Disciples, gives them, *what to say in that hour*? If this be their meaning, one should think, the HOLY GHOST could inspire them with the *Gift of Tongues*, and teach them, all at once, to speak strange languages, as well as unthought of words: And I would have these pretenders to inspiration to go up to the *Highlands of Scotland*, or over among their *Brethren Presbyterians in France*, and make the experiment there, whether the HOLY GHOST will inspire them, with the gift of speaking *Irish* or *French*: Unless they can give us this demonstration of their being inspir'd by the HOLY GHOST, we should be but fools to believe them. St. Paul says indeed in one place, 1 Cor. xiv. 14. *I will pray with the spirit, and with the understanding also*: But what follows, *I will sing with the spirit*, says he, *and with the understanding also*. If *praying with the spirit* there, direct us to pray *extempore*, without using precompos'd prayers, does not *singing with the spirit*, direct us likewise to sing *extempore*, without using precomposed *Psalms*: And why do not the *Presbyterians* banish out of their *Kirks* the *Psalms of David*, which are so many forms of singing, as they have done the *LORD's Prayer*, that divine form of praying? The reason of this may be, that a great many of them that pretend to the gift of praying, have but little pretence to poetry, and tho' they can easily rabble out, what they call, a prayer of half an hour's length, without meditation, yet few of them, with an hour's study beforehand, could hammer one *Psalms*. But this pretence of *Inspiration* is now very little insisted on by them: They must confess they think on their prayers beforehand, and that it even costs them a while's study on the *Saturday's* afternoons and *Sunday's* mornings to consider what and how to speak to GOD when the people convene: Only, say they, prayers with-

out

out book (for they don't call them *extempore Prayers*) are more convenient for taking in all the different wants and necessities of the people, and so are preferable to *Set Forms*, which are and must be very deficient in this point. But is it not possible, that their Ministers, especially some of them of weak memories, may forget some part of the people's wants; as I have known some of them forget to pray for the sick, even when the Clerk at the beginning of the prayer had warn'd him to *remember* them: But,

My Brethren, you that are acquainted with our *Liturgy*, and have made it familiar to you, by seriously and constantly joining in it; is there any condition you can be in, any thing whatever you can desire, but what provision is made for it in the *Prayers* of the Church? Is there not care taken for your making a *general Confession* of your sins unto *GOD*, which is one necessary part of prayer, and for your receiving *Absolution* in his name and according to his will? Are there not supplications and petitions fitted for all your exigencies, for every situation you are or can be in? For the assistances of *GOD*'s holy spirit, for the pardon of your sins, for grace to help you in time of need, for deliverance from all your enemies, and for the continuance of *GOD*'s temporal blessings? Are there not thanksgivings appointed for all his mercies, of whatever kind or degree? It would fill a volume to enumerate and describe all the beauties of this excellent method of prayer used in our Church: Our solemn *Litany*, which is read every *Sunday*, can any thing be devised by Man more generally useful, more concisely comprehensive, more substantially devout, or better adapted to the whole Society of Christians? In which the Minister does not assume the whole work to himself, nor tie down the People to depend on his integrity or capacity: But where you are allowed to back and second your petitions with the Earnestness and Devotion of your own Tongues. Let the *Presbyterians* muster up all their Objections against it, and if they can, let them show you, wherein it is either superfluous or defective.

Our Liturgy throughout is exactly conformable to St. *Paul*'s Rule of Prayer, laid down by him, and observed by

by the whole *Catholick Church*, 1 *Tim.* ii. 1. We have good and orthodox *Supplications, Prayers, Intercessions* and *Thanksgivings* not only for our selves, but for all men. Indeed if we wanted to inflame your fancies, or raise in you an esteem for our personal endowments and abilities, we might entertain you with long winded sighing *Prayers*, as well as the *Presbyterians* do their hearers: I hope, the *Presbyterians* will not arrogate all the gift of *extempore Prayer* to their own *Party*, but will even acknowledge, that some of us can say something that way. If we had any end to pursue, or any interest to drive, if our business were to irritate *Servants* against their *Masters*, *Children* against their *Parents*, *Subjects* against their *Magistrates*, *Neighbours* and *Families* against one another, if we design'd to establish our own reputation, or work you up to an excessive liberality to our purses, I confess, *extempore Prayers* are the most effectual contrivance that can be for executing such intentions: A contrivance, which, former histories tell us, never fail'd of success. Was it not by means of the *extempore Prayers* which the *Covenanters* used, that the whole nation was inflam'd against their Sovereign K. *Charles I.*? Did not, that monster of nature, *Oliver Cromwel* always fall to praying when he had any mischief to accomplish, and was it not always *extempore Prayers* that he used? When the *Presbyterians* in the reigns of K. *James VIth*, K. *Charles I.* and K. *Charles the II.* were disoblig'd at the regal administration, did not they always use this *extempore* way of prayer to influence their followers, and hound them out to REBELLION? Was not this the method, that the infamously famous *Whitfield* took to fill his own coffers at the expences of his deluded hearers? And do not the *Presbyterian Ministers* at present take the same method in their *extempore Prayers* to stir up their people against yourselves, and all of our communion on account of the present unhappy commotions? In short, is it not very easy for a man that's left at liberty to pray what he pleases, is it not very easy for him to amuse his peoples ears with any kind of stuff, and considering the influence that such prayers have on poor silly people's brains, is it not a ready way to drive them on to any

I

thing

thing? But let our intentions be what they will, that's certain, we cannot abuse our prayers to answer our intentions. While we keep up to the *Forms* of the church, there's no such thing to be fear'd from us: And if we deviate from them, we deserve to be censur'd by our superiors. I shall dismiss this head with observing to you, *That extempore Prayers* were only introduc'd a considerable time after our *Reformation* here, by men that had rebellious designs to forward, and wanted to shew their wonderful *gifts* and *talents* to the people. Our *Liturgy* has never been despis'd but by those people, who have made themselves odious to the world for despising the *LORD's Prayer* itself: And when men, allow themselves to vilify and throw by the performance of the Master, 'tis no wonder that they have no regard for the labours and compositions of the servants.

3. A third ground of clamour against us, is our using *Ceremonies* in our *Religious Worship*: An objection, which one should be surprized to hear out of the mouths of any but fools. What do they call a *Ceremony*? they would need to explain themselves. Can any thing be done without some kind of *Ceremony*? Can we rise up, or walk, or eat, or drink, or perform any bodily action without some *Ceremony* or other, that is, without some posture, or gesture, or look, or motion, or some accidental thing or other which may be called a *Ceremony*? And how is it possible to worship GOD without some *Ceremony*? Is not standing at prayer a *Ceremony*? Is not sitting at a Sermon a *Ceremony*? And are not these *Ceremonies* indifferent? And if they be indifferent, have not the *Governors* of the *Church* a power either to command or forbid them as they see expedient: The *Presbyterians* will not deny this, they dare not deny it. Even *Calvin* himself and *Melancthon*, all the reformed Churches abroad are for *Ceremonies*, and allow the *Church Governours* to order whatever pertains to the decency of the *Church Worship*, as *Ceremonies* do. Even our Adversaries themselves have *Ceremonies* as well as we: They have a white Sheet in a penance for *Adultery*: They have ringing of Bells to conven the people: They use the *Ceremony* of joining hands in *Marriage*, they sprinkle

in

in *Baptism*, they lay their hands on the head in *Ordination*, they sit at singing of *Psalms* : With many more ceremonial Actions to be seen amongst them, for which they have no express command in *Scripture*, As indeed there was no necessity for such a command. Let every thing be done decently and in order, is warrant enough for all *Church Governors* to appoint or prohibit what *Ceremonies* they please, so be they never go against GOD's written word. So that, even by the allowance of *Scripture*, by the practice of all *Antiquity*, by the Judgment of all *Reformers* and *reformed Churches*, yea, by the very voice of reason itself we see that *Ceremonies* may be used in religious matters ? What then can be the reason of the *Presbyterians* quarrelling so much at our *Ceremonies* ? It plainly appears that they quarrel at them, not because they are *Ceremonies*, but because they are ours. But,

If their *Ministers* have a privilege to appoint *Ceremonies* for themselves: why not our *Bishops* the same privilege to appoint *Ceremonies* for us ? Yet to shew you the groundlessness of their invidious calumnies, I shall take notice of some of the more remarkable of our *Ceremonies*, which the *Presbyterians* exclaim so bitterly against. One is, our bowing to the *east*, which one of their *Preachers* in this Country represents in hideous colours, not only as *Popery* but even as *Heathenism*, and told his people, that the wind turn'd to the *East* when our Meeting Houses were burnt, to blow away that *Paganish* custom we had of bowing to the *East*.

Besides that this assertion is false, (some of our Meeting-Houses having been burnt when the Wind was directly West) it seems, the Objector did not well know our custom, nor how we used it. But,

Who would have thought, that *Englishmen* and *Christians*, nay even good *Protestants*, should ever have been employed in destroying and burning *Chapels* and *Meeting-Houses* ; in which their own *Prayer-Book* was used every Sunday, &c. throughout the Year ; and not only so, (referring to the *trémisco*!) but likewise, that they would make the *Bibles* and *Prayer-Books* accompany one another in the Flames ? — Great and loud were the outcries, both in the

the Pulpits and common conversations, of the danger we were in of having our *Bibles* burnt ; but, let Experience teach us, against whom these outcries should have been pointed.

We look to the *East* when we repeat the Creed, and we bow our heads at the holy name of JESUS ? Can this be called *Heathenish*, or does it deserve so strong exclamations ? No ! but they will maintain that we worship toward the *East*, and that by so doing we imitate the *Heathens* : Well, be it so, that we actually do worship toward the *East*, we do nothing more than what the primitive Christians did : And in their footsteps we are not ashamed to follow. It was so universally common, that there's scarce any Church Historian but speaks of it. The Author of the questions and answers, (which some ascribe to *Justin Martyr*, who lived about 180 years after CHRIST) tells us, they bowed to the *East*, because it was accounted the most excellent part of the Creation. St. *Basil* (who liv'd anno 370) reckons it amongst the traditions that had been derived from the *Apostles*, and gives this as the reason for it, that hereby they respected *Paradise*, begging of GOD to be restor'd to that antient habitation. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, (who lived anno 204) tells us that herein they had respect to CHRIST, who is in Scripture stiled the Son of Righteousness, *Malachi*. iv. 2. *the day spring from on high*. St. *Luke* i. 78. the BRANCH, (or as other commentators render it) the EAST, *Zech*. iii. 8. vi. 12. But whatever the true reason of it was, 'tis certain from these testimonies that it was an antient practice. St. *Athanasius* (who liv'd anno 350) gives us a very reasonable account of it ? *We do not* says he, *Worship toward the East, as if we thought GOD were any ways shut up in those Parts of the World, but because GOD is in himself the true light and is so stilled in Scripture. In turning therefore towards that created light we do not worship it, but the great creator of it : Taking occasion from that excellent element to adore that GOD, who was before all elements and ages of the world.*

If these holy men were *Idolaters*, I cannot tell who can be free from that imputation : And if men, that lived 400, some of them within 100 years of the *Apostles*, could not

not see what was *Apostolic* and what was *Idolatrous*, it is something strange, that men at 1500 years distance should see it better.

Another *Ceremony* which they have long levelled their darts at, is, *Our signing with the sign of the Cross in Baptism*. They will not let the *English Church* vindicate themselves for using this *Ceremony*, as they have sufficiently done, to any impartial reader, in the thirteenth of their Canons published *anno* 1604. When it was at first brought into the Church is uncertain : St. *Basil* reckons it to be among the *Apostolical Traditions* : *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian* speak of it : As does likewise St. *Jerom*. Yea, not only did the antients sign with the *cross in Baptism*, but they used it likewise in the commonest actions of their lives : *Tertullian* tells us, *That upon every motion, at their going out and coming in, at their going to bed or at meals, or whatever employment or occupation called them, they were wont to stamp their forehead with the sign of the cross*. By this they shewed that they were not ashamed of the *Cross* of CHRIST, nor unwilling to engage in the service of a *crucified Master*, which yet was a great scandal to the heathen World then, as it is now to the *Presbyterians*. In that 30th Canon of the *English Church*, the Child is declar'd to be baptized upon sprinkling with water and repeating the words of the Institution whether the Sign of the Cross be added or not : Only she doth retain the *Sign of the Cross*, in conformity with the primitive times, to signify that the Child is now dedicated to the service of him, who died on the Cross, as by the Words in the book of Common Prayer. Indeed so great a respect did the antients bear to the representation of our SAVIOUR's Death, that they took care that the *Sign of the Cross* should be put to no trivial uses, should not be made upon the Ground, or on pavements, or on any place where it might be trampled upon, as is expressly provided by a Law of *Theodosius* and *Valentinian*, who reigned about the year 880. It seems some dying spark of that regard antiently paid to the *Sign of the Cross*, is kept up among ourselves to this Day, tho' I believe indeed unwittingly and without design : As is to be seen from the Custom of cutting it out on the ground in some Places, to stop people's

people's passing that way, as judging that no Christian would willingly tread upon that *sacred Sign*. Thus it is that we use the *Sign of the Cross* not out of Worship, but out of reverence, not looking on it as an essential point of holiness, but as a demonstration of our respect for the memory of him who died for us upon it.

Our adversaries likewise find fault with us for admitting *Godfathers and Godmothers to answer for Children at their Baptism*. But all *Church Histories* are so exact and positive in this, that the *Presbyterians* themselves cannot deny it. We cannot read one of the earliest *Fathers* without meeting with the use of *Sureties* or *Cautioners*, at *Baptism*: And dare the *Presbyterians* say that this is against *Scripture*? Let them produce one single passage in the *new Testament*, where a Parent is either commanded to present his Child to be baptized, or whether there is the least mention of doing so: And if it be not taken notice of there, with what face can they quarrel a *Church* for following *Antiquity*? I own, *Antiquity* is no warrant for *Error*, neither can it be adduced as a Plea for a wrong thing, to say that it was of an old date: But how shall a thing be proved to be wrong, but by *Scripture*? and 'tis but an unreasonable cavil at best to give any practice odious titles, unless they can make good what they say. Now, if this Custom of using *Sureties in Baptism* be not contrary to GOD's word (and if it be, let them shew where) then I should think, the *Church* cannot be blamed for doing therein, as was done in the times that are freest from heresies or corruptions: And that it was so, is as clear as the Day. Nay, which is an argument in our favours, that our enemies cannot get over, the *Calvinists* at *Geneva* use *Godfathers*, and our first *Reformers* in *Scotland* retained this old practice too: For in the Petition drawn up by the *Lords of the Congregation*, and presented in their name to the *Queen Regent* by the *Laird of Calder* anno, 1558, one article is, *That Baptism may be administred in the vulgar tongue, to the intent that the Godfathers and Witnesses may understand the nature of the Contract, &c.*

Indeed, all that the *Presbyterians* can say against it, is the unreasonableness of the thing, that *Parents* should by debarr'd

debarr'd the privilege of answering for their child, and *Strangers* admitted, who perhaps will have little or no concern for the child's education: Now to this I answer, The right that the *Parent* has to take care of his child and see it educated, is a natural right given him by *GOD* which no law of man can take from him: And this inherent right 'tis supposed every conscientious *Parent* will exercise, whether he be bound to it by any outward engagement or not: So that the design of taking in others to be *Sureties for the Child*, is to provide the more effectually for the godly bringing up of the *Child*, and to be a check and inspector upon the *Parent*, in case of his slackness or negligence. As for the carelessness of these *Sureties*, 'tis a great fault in them if they forget what they voluntarily promised; but it can be no defect in the *Constitution of the Church*: They may, upon the same score, object against admitting *Parents* to answer for them: For do we not see many *Parents* cast a careless account of their children how they be trained up, and thousands of children, when brought to untimely ends for their wicked lives, lay all the blame on their *Parents*, that had taken so little care of them? And as we see children suffering by their *Parents* sloth, so in *England* there are to be seen numbers of poor destitute children virtuously and piously brought up by *Sureties*, that had a sense of their duty, and a regard for innocent souls. So that since the use of *Godfathers in Baptism* is not contrary to *Scripture*, since it was the practice of all Antiquity, us'd even at *Geneva*, and in this *Church* at the *Reformation*, since 'tis neither against nature nor reason, but instituted for very good ends, I cannot see what arguments our neighbours can bring to disprove the use of it. But,

The principal cause of outcry against us, is, *Our kneeling at the Sacrament*, which they condemn as *Idolatry*, *Superstition*, *Popery*, and I cannot tell what more frightful names. Our *SAVIOUR*, say they, and his *Apostles* did not *kneel at the Sacrament* as we do. Neither did they sit, as the *Presbyterians* do: The custom at feasting among the *Jews* was to ly along upon beds or couches, as the *Evangelists* tell us *JESUS* did, tho' our translators have render'd that *Greek word* by sitting. This was his gesture at eating
the

the *Passover*, St. *Matth.* xxvi. 20. St. *Luke* xxii. 14. St. *John* xiii. 12. St. *Mark* xiv. 18. But no mention what posture he put himself in at the institution of the *Sacrament*, which followed his eating the *Passover*. We hear, that *he took bread and blessed it, and gave thanks* (*eulogese* and *eucharistese*) which are parts of the *Priestly Office*, and which we are not to think that he did in the same posture with common eating. But, granting this to be only conjecture, I hope, our enemies will not say positively that he sat at these solemn actions, more than we can say that he kneeled: So that our LORD's example will avail them nothing.

In the *primitive Church* they had no fixt *Posture*: sometimes they kneeled, sometimes they stood, as they do in *Geneva* and among the *Protestants* in *France* at this day: But we never find that they sat: And the most learned *Dissenters* in *England* grant, that sitting is not necessary. But, say they, *Kneeling at the Sacrament* has been abused to *Idolatry*: Therefore it should be laid aside. Has not the LORD's *Supper* itself been abused? *Religion* and *Christianity*, have not they been abused? Should they therefore be laid aside. But idolatrous *Papists* kneel at receiving the *Sacrament*, and we should have no fellowship with idols: And no man, say they, can commit *Idolatry*, *sitting*. But what says St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* viii. 10. *If any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the Idol's temple, shall not he be emboldned to eat those things offered to idols?* Here is *idolatrous sitting*, suppos'd by the *Apostle* to be a means for perverting others to *Idolatry*. Had the *Apostle* call'd it *Kneeling*, how would our adversaries triumphed? And nothing more common in profane writers, than *sitting* at heathen sacrifices, especially at the sacrifices of *Hercules*. So that *sitting* may be abused to *Idolatry* as well as *kneeling*. Nay the *Pope* himself *sits*, and the *Socinians*, these enemies of CHRIST's Divinity, they *sit* too: The *Pope* *sits* on account of his great honour, as being CHRIST's VICAR, and in CHRIST's stead upon earth; And the *Socinians* *sit* to denote their equality with CHRIST, whom they deny to be GOD of one substance with the Father. This is what the *Presbyterians* say for their *sitting*. *Kneeling*, say they,

they, imports inferiority, therefore it is contrary to the privilege of *Co-heirs*: And whatsoever liberty guests have at a common-feast table, the same liberty have communicants at the LORD's table. Now,

This is full of so many absurdities, that I wonder how any man can mention it. Why don't they drink healths and entertain one another with mutual discourse at the LORD's table, since they say they have liberty so to do? In short, if they tax us with *Idolatry* in *Kneeling*, we may justly charge them with irreverence and profaneness in *Sitting*: And if we be *Papists* for receiving in a posture of adoration, let them see how they can vindicate themselves from being *Arians* and *Socinians* for receiving in a posture of equality and fellowship with CHRIST. But *Kneeling* is a gesture so proper for humble suppliant sinners in all their addresses and prayers to GOD, even according to *Calvin's* judgment, that I need say no more to recommend it, and preserve you stedfast in the observation of so laudable and significant a practice.

The last of our *Ceremonies* which I shall mention, as attack'd by the *Presbyterians*, is our keeping *Holy-days*, which, say they, is manifest *Will-worship*, in doing more than we are required to do: The commandment enjoins our sanctifying only one day, and allows us the other six for our labour: But we, indeed, must go beyond that, and think to complement GOD Almighty by giving him back a part of that time he has allow'd to our own employments. Now, I think, if we deserve censure at all on this score, 'tis because of our remissness, and for falling short of that religious zeal which prevail'd among the first Christians. We think it a great deal to observe one or two remarkable festivals: But what is this in comparison of that wonderful exactness and frequency, which the old *Fathers* tell us was to be seen in their days? Every *Wednesday* and *Friday* were days of *Publick Worship* then, on which they fasted till three o'clock afternoon: And nothing occurs after in their writings, than an account of solemnizing the deaths of *eminent Martyrs* by acts of religious worship on the yearly returns of these days on which they suffer'd. Besides these, they had other holy days uni-

K

versally

versally celebrated all over the christian world. And these were of two sorts. The one, days of fasting and humiliation, in which they solemnly deprecated *G O D*'s judgments, and implor'd him to be gracious to them, and mercifully to pardon their iniquities : Days of this kind were from time to time appointed. But they had one grand yearly fast which they called *LENT* and which was set apart for the more abstracted exercises of solemn meditation and prayer : That this *yearly Fast* was of very antient observation, cannot be deny'd : Tho' there were different practices in different ages as to the length and continuance of it : But all agreed in keeping the last week of it (which we call the *PASSION week*) with the utmost strictness and mortification. Testimonies for the truth of this are to be had out of *Socrates, Sozomen, Chrysostom*, the laws of *Theodosius the great, Gratian, Valentinian, &c.* Their other kind of holy days were *Festivals* or days of thanksgiving to *GOD* for his remarkable mercies, and supplication to him for continuance of his blessings and lovingkindnesses to them. The chief of these were three, *EASTER*, which they solemniz'd in memory of *CHRIST's Resurrection*, *PENTECOST* in commemoration of the descent of the *Holy Ghost*, and *CHRISTMAS*, or the *Birth-Day* of our *LORD*.

That the celebration of *Easter* is of very old date, and may be reckon'd an *Apostolick Institution*, will appear from the famous dispute between the *East Church*, with *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna* at their head, and the *Roman Church*, with *Anicetus* Bishop of *Rome* at their head, about the time of solemnizing this grand festival, which dispute was begun about the 120th year of our *LORD*, and about 20 years after the death of the Apostle *St. John* : The *Eastern Church* kept it on the same day that the *Jews* kept their *Passover*, and pleaded the examples of the Apostles *St. Philip* and *St. John* : The *Roman Church* kept it on the *LORD's* day next after the *Jewish Passover*, for which they likewise pleaded *Apostolick Tradition*. About 60 years after, this contest was renewed between *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus* and *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, and so it continued, till the first general Council of *Nice*, anno 325, decided the controversy, and appointed this feast to be kept

as it now is. It would be endless to recite all the passages of the *Fathers* in which the observation of *Easter* is mention'd as the standing practice of the Church. Only I shall take notice, that the festival of WHITSUNDAY or PENTECOST is still spoken of as following *Easter*, by *Irenæus* anno, 180, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Origen* and so downward, who tell us that the whole intervening fifty days after *Easter* was a holy season, and in a manner reckon'd festival, being set apart for conferring *Baptism*, and for sacred joy and rejoicing.

The third great festival of the church, CHRISTMAS, seems indeed not to be so early; as it is not so soon mentioned, as the other two: Yet we have account of it from *Theophilus* Bishop of *Cæsarea* about the year 140. However, that it was kept before the year 300, we have this melancholly instance, that *Diocletian*, the cruel persecutor, burnt a whole congregation of christians, that assembled in a Church at *Nicomedia* to solemnize the festival of CHRIST's *Nativity*. Perhaps the *Presbyterians* have nothing to say against this argument, but want of opportunity to present the argument to us again. That it was always kept on the 25th of *December*, I shall not say: Only *St. Chrysostom* tells us that in his time about 360 years after CHRIST, it was kept on that day at *Antioch*; other sacred days, as I told you, they had in memory and honour of pious *Martyrs*, that had laid down their lives in defence of the *Gospel*, on which they gave thanks to GOD for their good example, and propos'd their constancy and zeal to be followed by themselves. Now,

After this short account of the *Fasts* and *Festivals* of the Church, let any man tell you, what's to blame about them? Is it because the Church takes upon her to appoint any other sacred days, than *Sunday*? and do not the *Presbyterians* the like? Does not their *General Assembly* prescribe *Fasts* and *Thanksgivings*, and that too with grievous threats to such as do not observe them? And has not our Church the same liberty? Indeed, if any of the antient Christians, those mirrours of piety and devotion, were to come among us and survey our actions and deportments, they would mightily blame us, not for our superstition in keeping

keeping so many holy days, but for our coldness and lukewarmness in keeping so few. Let the *Presbyterians* rail and inveigh at us as much as they please, while we have the Christians of the *Apostolic Age* for our pattern, their accusations will be found to be but groundless and vain. I might here have said something concerning other two *Rites* used among us, and they are *Consecration of Churches* and *Churching of Women* : But the decency of those two practices appear to every one, even to some of the more moderate and candid *Presbyterians* themselves, and I never yet heard of much ill nature at us on either of these heads. So that I proceed to the fourth complaint which the *Presbyterians* bring against us, and that is *POPERY*, that we are all rank Papists and Symbolizers with the Church of *Rome*. This has been a wonderful argument, and the great stress of all their reasoning for these two hundred years past, and has had mighty success with the populace to inveigle them over to their *Party*. But let them name particulars, and tell us, wherein we are *Papists*. Or rather what is it they call *POPERY* ? Why, say they, 'tis the corruption of the Church of *Rome*, whereby they have defac'd the *Doctrine*, the *Worship*, the *Government*, every thing, in a word, about the *Christian Church*. I explain *POPERY* for them, because there are a great many of them, I know, that make no little use of the word, *POPERY*, that cannot explain it to themselves. Now, I would ask, when did *POPERY*, or the corruptions of the *Church of Rome*, begin? Sure they did not begin with the *Apostles* ? There must be some after date to fix their beginning at : It is only the *Innovations* of that Church, which even the *Presbyterians* call *POPERY* : And *Innovations* cannot be antient. But I shall name a time for them to begin *POPERY* at, and shall grant them as much as can be granted, or as themselves will desire. Now,

I think no reasonable man will begin *PoperY* sooner, than the time when the Bishops of *Rome* assum'd the title of *Universal Bishop*, which we read, *Boniface* the third of that name ventur'd to do under the reign of the Emperor *Phocas* about 600 years after *CHRIST*. No man, I say, will begin the corruptions and innovations of the Church of
Rome

Rome farther back, as this is generally reckon'd the first depravation it can be charged with. And from this time, by virtue of that *Universal* power, which *Boniface* assumed then and his successors kept up after that, from this time were all the *Errours* and *Additions* and *Deviations* introduced among them, which has been the Burden of the *Western Church* for a long time, and has been, by unanimous consent of reformed writers, call'd *Popery*. No historian ever charg'd the Church of *Rome* with varying from the truth, and bringing in singular novelties before the year 600, other than what the Bishops might have fallen into thro' human weakness, as in the cases of *Liberius* the *Arian*, *Vigilius* the *Eutychian*, *Honorius* the *Monothelite*, and some unreasonable power that one or two of the *Popes* made a pretence to about the time of St. *Augustine*: yet no writer that ever I read of called any of these *Popery*, in the sense that we take *Popery* in now. Their *Bishops* were for the most part, learned, pious men, and the Church of *Rome* was look'd on as the Standard of christian purity. Now, if *Popery* did not begin sooner than the year 600, why do the *Presbyterians* tax us with *Popery* for imitating the practice and example of the Church of CHRIST before that time? Yet, to shew the strength and justice of our cause, I shall allow them 200 years more into the reckoning, and shall grant to them, if they demand it, that about the year 400 the Church of *Rome* began to be corrupted, and to plague the *Christian Church* with her new fangle Doctrines: Even with this allowance, and I think they will not desire more, 'tis unreasonable to charge us with *Popery*. Let them name but one single instance, in which the *Presbyterians* differ from us, which was not in the Church before the year 400: *Episcopacy*, *Set Forms of Prayer*, *Cross in Baptism*, *Observation of holy Days*, &c. All our Doctrines, Rites and Practices, whereby we are distinguished from them, all these were receiv'd and taught by the *Catholick Church* in the four first Centuries. And if the *Presbyterians* can but prove one *Article*, *Ceremony* or *Custom* of ours, (as distinguish'd from theirs) later than the year 400, they will gain the Point.

Some of their own Doctors have been conscious of this :
And

And therefore they call us *Papists*, not for believing and observing things introduc'd in *Popish* times, but for agreeing with the *Papists* in believing and observing some things which the *Papists* believe and observe. This they call *Romanizing* and *Symbolizing* with the *Church of Rome*, bullying words to impose on country people. That's to say, they condemn some things not because they are bad, but because they are *Popish*, as if a man should refuse to wear a Hat, because his declared enemy wears one. But is this agreeable to St. *Paul's* Rule, *Prove all things, hold fast the best* : Because the *Papists* have sifted the chaff among the pure corn of Christianity, must we throw away the corn with the chaff ? Is it not our duty rather with care to pick out the gold of sound doctrine from among the rubbish, in which they have endeavoured to hide it ? But if every thing be to be thrown away, that the *Papists* keep, why do the *Presbyterians* observe the LORD's Day, or baptize infants, or debar offenders from the LORD's Supper ? Why do they believe *Original sin* or use the word *Trinity* : The *Papists* do all these ; and so do we ? Why have the *Presbyterians* these things in common with us ? Neither they, nor the *Papists*, nor we can adduce Scripture precepts for what we do in these points : We must resolve all into the tradition and example of the *Church*. But of what *Church* ? Not of the corrupted *Church of Rome*, with the *Pope* at its head, as the *Papists* do ; Nor of the *Lay Church of Geneva*, with the judgment of Mr. *Calvin* as it's rule, as the *Presbyterians* do : But of the *universal Church* from the *Apostles* times down to the year 400 : And what a monstrous piece of confidence is it, to deny or doubt the testimony of these men for what was done in their own days, and rather believe the assertions and allegations, which a few moderns have spun from their own Brains.

Whether we may safely believe every doctrine, which the *primitive Fathers* taught I shall not say. Some of them might have err'd in some particular matters, and we never yet said, that any one of them was infallible : But when they tell us, that such and such things were done in their Days, that the whole *Church* believed and acted so
and

and so, certainly we are bound to give historical faith to their narrations : And without having recourse to this historical faith, not even the *Presbyterians* themselves can give a solid account of, or reason for a good many things which they do. The historians, that liv'd in King *James* the VIth's time, are more capable to give us a true relation of the remarkable occurrences that happen'd in his time, than any writer can be now : And if *Buchanan*, or any other that wrote in those days, should tell us that K. *James* was baptized in the *Popish* way with all the trumpery of *Papistical Ceremonies*, shall we not believe him rather than one in our own Days, that would contradict it ? 'Tis just so with respect to the *primitive Fathers* : Whatever their doctrines were, their testimonies are certainly to be believed : And, tho' we do not depend upon them as authors of doctrines, we may very well admit them as witnesses of matters of fact. Now, where the Scriptures are silent, what better warrant can we have than the relations of such honest witnesses, who could know the truth and would by no means tell an untruth ? They that despise *Antiquity*, should consider what a mighty handle they give to the enemies of *Reveal'd Religion*, by despising or undervaluing those, that have been the principal supporters of it. But neither do the *Presbyterians* despise *Antiquity* : All their vexation is, that *Antiquity* contradicts them : As we may see by the pother that they make about any passage of *Antiquity*, which but seems to favour them. Now, if *Antiquity* may be admitted as judge in matters of fact, that is, if we may believe the *Antient Fathers* when they say that such and such things were observ'd in their times, (and sure the *Presbyterians* will not stick at that) then I think we have gain'd all that we ask. Let the *Presbyterians* name one *Popish* Rite which we observe, and if it cannot be shewn, that the *Church* of CHRIST observed it before the year 400, then we must yeild to them. And if the *Church* observed any rite so early, the *Presbyterians* should be ashamed to cavil at us for imitating them, &c. &c. &c.

And now, my Brethren, that I have shewn you what kind of Spirits these *Presbyterians* are, and have vindicated
our

our Church from their strongest objections, let me beseech and obtest you by all that's valuable and dear to you, by the regard you ought to have to your immortal Souls, and your hopes of salvation in the communion of the *Catholick Church*, if any consideration will have weight with you I beseech you *believe them not*, neither be led astray by them. You that have been baptized into CHRIST's Church, and have all along been happy in the participation of the ordinances of CHRIST's appointment, administered to you in the way of CHRIST's appointment, consider the sinfulness and danger of apostatizing from your engagements, and willingly going off to a *Schism*: A *Schism* of the blackest nature, not only from, but even against the Governours of the Church: A *Schism*, where the grossest spiritual *Rebellion* is encouraged, and deadly heresies taught. Perhaps you'll ask me, what I call a *Schism*, and why, I call the *Presbyterian* Religion a *Schism*? By a *Schism* I mean a willful separation from the lawful rulers and governours of CHRIST's Church: And I call the *Presbyterians* Schismatics, because they at first separated themselves, and still continued the separation, from the *Bishops*, whom I have shewn to be, by divine appointment, the only Governours of the Church: And not only so, but they have declared the whole *Order* devilish and antichristian, and done all that lay in their power to extirpate it, notwithstanding of it's being CHRIST's *Institution*: And have sacrilegiously taken upon themselves to receive members into CHRIST's Church and to ratify covenants with the people in CHRIST's name, without any *commission* from him. This I call sacrilegious, because it was an invading another's office, a sacred office which did not belong to them. And this sacrilege they persist in to this Day.

By their own confession, our *Saviour* instituted a certain order of men, to rule and govern his Church, and these men he empowered to name their Successors, and they theirs, promising to be *with them to the end of the World*. Accordingly, we find the *Apostles* ordaining *Bishops* to govern the Church, and giving them power to ordain inferior Church Officers for administering the Sacraments: And neither in Scripture, nor in Church histories do we
read

read of *Church Ministers* being ordain'd, but only by *Bishops*. Even *Jerom* himself, the great friend, whom the *Presbyterians* boast so much of, even he attributes the power of *Ordination* to the *Bishop*: *What is it*, says he, *that a Bishop does more than a Presbyter, excepta Ordinatione*, except *Ordination*: And all the *Fathers* that seem most to speak of an equality between a *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, &c. all unanimously speak of *Ordination* as belonging solely to the *Bishop*: And if *Ordination* be the *Bishops* Province, shall we account the *Ordination* of these men valid, who have been ordain'd not only without, but even in despite of the whole order of *Bishops*: In all *Antiquity* we never read of one instance of *Presbyterian Ordination*, but only one, and that was, of one *Ischyrras*, ordain'd by *Colluthus* a *Presbyter*: But how was this look'd on? It was highly resented by the whole *Church*, and *Ischyrras* was (not deposed because he was no Clergyman but) commanded to remain among the *Laity*, as having never been ordain'd. The *Presbyterians* see, what *John Knox* or any of their first *Ordainers* had to expect if he had liv'd in these Days. Indeed the *Presbyterians* say for themselves that in the *Gothick Churches* for almost 70 years, *Presbyters* had the Government: And it was so too in our own *Scottish Church*, say they, till *Palladius* was made *Bishop*: But allowing there had been no *Bishops* all that time in these Churches, does it follow that the *Presbyters* had power to ordain one another?

The *Episcopal* qualify'd Church in *Scotland*, since the *Revolution*, has had no *Bishop* among them; yet are their *Presbyters* allowed to ordain one another as the *Presbyterians* do? No, they are all ordain'd by the *Bishop* of *London*. So is the Church in our *English* colonies in the *West Indies*, they have no *Bishops* among them; yet their *Presbyters* have *Episcopal Ordination*. And that it was so in the *Gothick* and *Scottish Churches*, at the time when the *Presbyterians* say they had no *Bishops*, even allowing what they say to be true, is evident from the concurrent practice of all Churches at that time. We read in *Eusebius's* church history, that that two young christians of *Alexandria*, *Frumentius* and *Aedesius*, having been by some how or other

carried into *India*, and by GOD's blessing converted some of these nations to the *Christian Faith*, yet would not take upon them to administer Sacraments, or ordain others, or any way act as *Ministers* of CHRIST's Church, till they came back to *Alexandria*, and were CANONICALLY ordain'd by *Athanasius* Bishop of that place. Here is an example very near a kin to our *Reformation*: And if our *Reformers* had all acted on *Church Principles*, tho' they might have scrupled the *Popish Bishops*, yet they might have had *Bishops* ordain'd by the reformed *English Bishops*, and by that means might had CHRIST's ordinances lawfully administered to them. But,

For *Presbyters* to set up a communion contrary to their *Bishops*, and to pretend to ordain others to keep up this contrary communion, this is the height of *Schism* and a sin which no necessity can plead for. And a sin too, the most odious and most damnable, that any person can be guilty of. Let us only consider the *Schism* of *Korah* and some other *Levites* against their *High Priest Aaron*: They pretended great things, that it was to redress grievances and so, which is all the *Presbyterians* can say for themselves: Yet this did not hinder the judgment of GOD from seizing on these SCHISMATICAL *Intruders*: The whole passage is worth the reading as you have it, *Num. xvi.* and I shall give you the excellent enlargement of *Optatus* Bishop of *Milevis* upon it, in his first book against the *Schismatical Donatists*; page 25. "That *Schism*, says he, is a great
 " sin, yourselves cannot deny: Yet without fear you have
 " imitated your wretched Masters *Corah*, *Dathan* and
 " *Abiram*, nor have considered that this sin is forbidden
 " by GOD's word, and the commission of it grievously
 " punished. I shall instance in three sins, prohibited by
 " GOD's word, *Murder Idolatry* and *Schism*. Let us see in
 " these three what GOD punished and what he thought
 " fit to pardon. Of all murders *Parricide*, (or the murdering of father or brother) is the greatest: Yet *Cain*,
 " when guilty, was not slain by GOD, and his being slain
 " by another severely condemn'd. In *Nineveh* there were
 " 120,000 idolaters: Yet, after the preaching of *Jonah*,
 " prayer and a little fasting procured their pardon: Let

" us see, if any such favour was granted to the first
 " SCHISMATICKS among GOD's people. Over so
 " many thousands of *Israel* only *Aaron* was appointed
 " *Priest*: But when some of his *Ministers*, not satisfied
 " with the dispensation, had invaded this *sacred office*, and
 " had brought two hundred of their fellows with censers
 " in their hands to offer incense before the people. GOD
 " could not see with pleasure this *Schism*. He was angry
 " with a great anger, and what he neither did to *Murder-*
 " *ers* nor *Idolaters*, he did to SCHISMATICKS. The
 " band of *Levites*, and the sacreligious multitude that fol-
 " lowed them, stood, with their forbidden sacrifices, ready
 " to perish: They were deny'd the space of repentance,
 " because their sin was such as could not be allowed par-
 " don———And that their sudden death might not ap-
 " pear a favour, as they were not worthy to live, so they
 " were not allowed to die; Being shut up in that infernal
 " cave, they were buried before they were dead. What
 " have ye to say to this, says he to the *Donatists*, ye that,
 " under the name of the *Church*, secretly nourish and im-
 " pudently defend a *Schism*."

The great *Schism*, which the *Samaritans* made from
 the Temple of *Jerusalem*, when they erected their Altar
 on mount *Gerizim*, was like the separation or *Schism* that
 the *Presbyterians* made from their *Bishops*: And we find
 how our SAVIOUR disapproved of it in his conference with
 the *Samaritan* woman, *John* iv. *Ye worship*, says he, *ye*
know not what: We know what we worship, for Salvation
is of the Jews: intimating to her, that their *Samaritan*
Worship, as being *Schismatical*, had no title to salvation.
 And when he cured the ten lepers, of whom one was a *Sa-*
maritan Schismatick, he sent not that one for a declarati-
 on of his being cleansed, to the *Schismatical Church* of *Sam-*
aria, of which he was a member, as he would certain-
 ly have done had it been a *Lawful* establishment, but to
 the *Church* at *Jerusalem*, plainly signifying, that the *Schif-*
matical Church of *Samaria* was no church, and their wor-
 ship not acceptable to GOD.

In *St. Paul's* epistles, *Schisms* and *Divisions* are re-
 presented to be great sins, and ranked among the *Works*
 of

of the flesh. It were needless to tell you, in what ugly colours all the *Fathers* paint this horrid sin of SCHISM, comparing it with *Murder, Idolatry, &c.* Every sin, in a word that mankind shudders at the mention of: And the abhorrence that they express of it in words, they testified in their Practice.

When the *Arian heresy* universally prevailed, that abominable heresy which deny'd CHRIST to be the Son of GOD, and the *orthodox Bishops* were turn'd out of their churches to make room for the *Schismatical Intruders*, did the christians communicate with the *Hereticks*, or think it a matter of indifference, as it is thought now, to join their assemblies? No, they chose rather to retain the purity of their faith, than catch the opportunity of religious worship; and before they would go into the churches, that were profan'd by these sacrilegious wretches, they suffered willingly all kind of cruel treatment: So it was in the case of the *Donatists* in *Africa*, the *Novatians* at *Rome*, and the *Miletians* in *Egypt*: These were all followers of *Schismatical Bishops*, that had set up opposite Altars, and maintain'd opposite communions apart from the CANONICAL *Bishops*: And by many of these *Schisms*, the church was miserably distressed: The *orthodox Christians* were forbid to assemble in publick to worship GOD, and when they did meet to that purpose, they were harshly used; Yet they bore all patiently: The uprightness of their cause was sufficient comfort to them, and GOD at last was pleased to send them relief. Yet what shall be said of those among us, who, without any prospect of danger, merely out of levity and curiosity, have join'd the *Schism* in it's present flourishing situation, to the manifest risque of their own Salvation: A *Schism*, wherein they have none of the Sacraments of CHRIST's Church administer'd, and consequently can have no Gospel title to eternal life. Wonder not, my brethren, at this: For do we think, did JESUS CHRIST appoint *Commissioners* to treat with the people in his name, and will he allow every *Usurper* to invade this *Commission*? Will any earthly King suffer any of his Subjects to act in quality of his ambassador, or ratify the acts of such a Subject, without letters empower-

empowering him so to do? And if the monarchs of this world be so jealous of their honour, will the great King of Heaven and earth be so careless of his? Our SAVIOUR said to his *Apostles*, *Go and baptize all nations, and lo I am with you*: But was this a permission to any of the *Jews* to baptize in CHRIST's name? He breath'd on them, and said, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c.* Did this impower any of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* to remit sins? At his last supper, he took bread and blessed it, and said to his *Apostles*, *Do this in remembrance of me*, Did this appoint any of his *Disciples* to administer the holy *Eucharist*? I scarce think it did. The necessity of being *commission'd* to this purpose, was so universally believed by the *Apostles*, and the succeeding *Fathers*, that even the inferior *Church-Officers* were never allowed to *baptize*, or consecrate the Sacrament, without the *Bishop's* leave. And we have no instance of any *Presbyter*, that ever took this upon him without such leave. But,

What shall we say of our *Presbyterian Teachers*, who not only *baptize* without a *Bishop's* leave, but even without his *Ordination*, mere *Lay-men*, that shook off their yoke of subjection, which they are bound to by all kind of sacred ties, and, in despite of the *Bishops*, the *only* governors of the *Church*, set up themselves to treat and act as CHRIST's *Ministers*, by virtue of an assum'd power of their own? Are such acts, do ye think, valid? Do their *Baptisms*, admit members into CHRIST's *Church*? Surely none, that have just notions of *Church Communion*, will believe that they do: Indeed they can say the *words of Institution* at *Baptism*, and can throw a little water on the child's face: But does this make such a child a christian, and entitle it to all the privileges of *Christian Baptism*: Any man can read a King's proclamation as well as a *Herald*, but how would a King look upon such a fellow? I can write a *Protection* to any of the present *Rebels*, as well as any officer in the army perhaps: But would a protection from me be a sufficient security to any of these poor creatures, or would any of them be so stupid as accept it? The reason is plain: The officers of the army have the King's

King's *Commission* to indemnify these offenders, which have not, and that makes the difference.

It is just so with respect to the *Presbyterian* Administrations: They can do every thing that way as well as we, but they want the *Commission*: And so all that they do is null and invalid. But, say they, we have a *Commission*. What *Commission* is it? It is not CHRIST's *Commission*, I am sure; 'tis a *Commission* of their own forging, and they know what all forgeries deserve. The present sett of teachers among them derive their sham *Ordinations* from the *Presbyteries* a little after the *Reformation*: And these *Presbyteries* were made up of *Presbyters*, that had rebell'd against their *Bishops*, or of mere *Lay-men*: Could such *Presbyteries* lawfully ordain *Ministers*? At that time indeed, *Ordination* was little thought of, and a well gifted man thought he had *Commission* enough to be a *Church-Officer*: So that, by the *Presbyterian Establishment* itself, even the *laying on the Hands* of the *Presbytery* is reckon'd but a circumstance: And if *Gifts* and *Graces* be *Call* enough to a man to baptize, and administer the Sacrament, one should think the *Apostles* and their followers but fools, to make such a pother about *Ordinations* and *Commissions*, when a few inward talents might have served: Nay, our SAVIOUR himself cannot be vindicated, that would not exercise his *Gifts* and *Graces* (which I hope the *Presbyterians* will grant he had) to the people's *Edification*, but would needs wait an outward call to that *Office*. We read, St. *Matth.* iii. 16: That when JESUS was baptized, the spirit of GOD descended on him, and there came a voice from Heaven, &c. From that time, St. *Matth.* iv. 17. JESUS began to preach. But why did he not preach before? Had he not *Gifts* and *Graces* and capacity to preach? Certainly he had: What did he want then? He wanted a *Commission*, which GOD gave him in such a visible manner. In short, in all societies, every publick officer is formally appointed and commissioned to his office, and intruders are severely punished: And in the church, which, by the *Presbyterian* confession, is a *spiritual, independent Society*, no man takes to himself the honour of being an officer, but he that is commissioned of GOD, as was Aaron,

Aaron. And what has been the fate of those that have presumptuously run upon GOD's errands without being sent, is sufficiently recorded in Scripture. The miserable end of *Korah*, Numb. xvi, The punishment of good King *Uzziah*, 2 *Chron.* xxvi. for invading the priest's office, the treatment of the seven sons of *Sceva*, *Acts* xix. these and many more stand as monuments of GOD's indignation against these, that sacrilegiously assume any part of the *priestly Office*, without being called in the way that he has appointed. And not only are the *Intruders* themselves thus severely punish'd, but the poor people, that are seduced by them, very often suffer with them. Not only *Korah* was punished for his *Schism*, but likewise the plague consumed fourteen thousand and seven hundred of the people; to be a caution in all ages not to join those that *Schismatically* rise up against their spiritual superiors. Besides, my brethren, consider this, that the *Presbyterians* do acknowledge us to be *lawfully ordain'd Ministers*, so that as long as you stay in communion with us, even by their concession, you are safe: But we deny that to them, and believe them to have no *ministerial Power*, other than what they have most unjustly invaded: And so, the doubt lies on their side, and 'tis at their door to clear the doubt and prove their *Ordination*: And this they cannot do, otherwise they would never have had recourse to *secret calls* and *inspir'd gifts*, if they could have prov'd the *validity* of it any other way. And,

If they cannot make good their *Commission*, what a miserable case are their blinded followers in, that have been so long deluded by them, and have all this time been without the comforting ordinances of CHRIST's Church, which can be administer'd by none but by those that are *lawfully* ordain'd to that purpose. If the officers of the army have no *Commission* to grant protections in their King's name, but have dar'd to do it of themselves, what a sorry taking are the poor fellows in, that have trusted to them, when the King comes to examine the thing? In such a situation are the *Presbyterians*: I do not say, what GOD Almighty has determin'd concerning them, neither do I meddle with his unreveal'd destinations; GOD forbid! All that I

say,

say, is, they have no *Gospel title* to the blessings and benefits which the blood of CHRIST has purchased for his church: And if they be in the same case with the unwillingly ignorant heathen, they are no better: They have nothing to look for but *GOD's uncovenanted mercies*. At the most, 'tis but a matter of great uncertainty, whether they be baptized, that is to say, whether they be christians or not: And themselves grant, that we are certainly baptized, that is, we are certainly christians. And so, my brethren, if you will go off from our *Communion*, where you are sure of *Christian* ordinances, and in which you have a *Gospel title* to Salvation, to a *Schismatical Party*, where it is a question whether they be christians or no, by so doing you mightily endanger your own souls, you forfeit your title to eternal life, and you have great reason to fear the fate of the *Schismatical Israelites*, of being consumed in one common destruction.

But you'll say, what shall we do? We have nothing else to do, but to join them: We have no assemblies of our own, no opportunities of worshipping *GOD*, or hearing instruction, or otherwise expressing our communion. My brethren, that's not your fault, 'tis a punishment, a calamity, which in *GOD's* good time will wear off: And he'll never condemn you for not doing what his providence has put it out of your power to do for some time. But cannot you worship *GOD* in your own hearts and at your own homes? Such of you as can read, have *Bibles* and *prayer Books*, in which you may very devoutly spend the *sacred time*: And such of you, as cannot read, live near more knowing neighbours, that will be ready to communicate of their blessings to you: And *GOD* will sanctify all these means to your spiritual profit. Besides,

If you think it unlawful to join them, you must suffer every thing rather than do any unlawful thing: Especially suffer the want of publick worship for a little, rather than take such a sinful and dangerous way to have it. Indeed publick worship is a duty on all christians, where it can be practised: But where it cannot be practised, the duty ceaseth. And no doubt you'll think the *LORD's* day very tedious, as not being allowed to spend it in the decent, commendable

mendable and pious way you us'd to do: But must not that be born with? A course of sickness or tract of adversity is tedious: But shall not these be endur'd, till health or prosperity come? I know your adversaries will be very liberal in giving you bad names, if you do not join them: They'll call you *Atheists*, *godless creatures*, that despise preachings and love to sit at home. Yet this is no more than what our SAVIOUR met with: The *Jews* call'd him a *Glutton* and a *Winebibber*, a *friend of publicans and sinners*: And if they treated the LORD so, *how much more those of his house*. Bad names and coarse language are still the arguments for a bad cause: And the more bad names they give you, you may believe they have the less to say: Could their *Schism* be defended by argument, let them make the experiment, and convince you of the lawfulness of joining them: And if they can do that, you'll have some excuse. But that's what they'll never strive to do: It matters little to them whether you go to Church or not: otherwise they would take more effectual methods to persuade you.

If their teachers be, what they call themselves, the persons to whom the care of souls is committed in their respective parishes, it belongs to them to punish *Seducers*, and prevent their sheep from going astray: If that be true, then *We*, the orthodox Clergy, are *Seducers*, and should be taken account of, and they cannot answer to GOD for their not endeavouring it sooner. If they say, they had no power sooner, let them do it now that they have power: Let them call us (the Clergy) before judges, and there openly accuse us of *Popery*, and *Idolatry*, and *Atheism*, and all the rest of it, and if we cannot vindicate ourselves to the world, then my bretheren, you'll be bound in conscience to forsake us: But this is what they have no mind to attempt: 'Tis the easier way to scold us out of their pulpits and throw foul language at us, and blind their ignorant followers against us. And more than this, they will take care not to be brought into: They know how little they have to say for themselves, if they were brought to a hearing, and therefore they always did, and always will decline a hearing. And upon that account I would have you

M

abstain

abstain from them, and believe them not what they say, till they can say something in a fairer, more formal way.

But say you, we are afraid of being forced to join them : A very unworthy, unchristian fear to be sure : who will force you ? The Government has not attempted it yet, and I hope, will not : Some of the more furious of their preachers may bully and terrify you with Soldiers, and burning and dragging, and the like, which are proper enough methods for planting their Kirks, but they have not all these at command : And if they had, tho' that should be the event, is not your faith dearer to you than every thing ? *In the world, says our Saviour, you shall have tribulation : But be of good cheer. Whoever will not forsake father and mother, &c. every thing in a word, says he, for my name's sake, is not worthy of me.*

The *Christian Religion* is the *Religion* of the *Cross*, and GOD has many ways of laying a cross before us : *Let us take up our Cross and follow CHRIST : Let us suffer with him here, if we ever expect to reign with him hereafter :* thro' suffering of this kind is our patience and constancy try'd, and we have the more glorious reward to look for. The *Will* can never be forc'd, and without the consent of the *Will* their can be no Sin. When the persecuting *Heathens* forc'd the *Christians* into their temples, and violently thurst the incense into their hands, were the *Christians* guilty of *Idolatry* ? No, they were not : They calmly bore that calamity, and GOD, who knew their intention, approved their innocence. But I hope no such thing shall be your case : We live among those who call themselves *Christians*, and to be sure none that pretend to that *sacred title*, will attempt to wound the consciences of their bretheren by such impositions.

Finally, my brethren, let me exhort you by all that's valuable to you, to stand fast in the profession of our suffering faith, to confirm and comfort one another, and ward off all the attacks of your adversaries, not with violence or foul language, but with *fervent Prayer* and a fixt resolution of perseverance : *So shall you reap in due time if ye faint not.* But if any of you will desert the *Communion of the Church*, in it's distressed state, and basely go in to the triumphant

phant Schism, to your Maker you must answer : *Your blood will be on your own head* : I hereby free myself before GOD from it. And,

May the GOD of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by CHRIST JESUS, after that ye have suffered a while make you perfect, stablish, settle you : To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. AMEN.

O deliver not the Soul of thy turtle dove unto the multitude of the enemies : And forget not the congregation of the Poor forever Psal. lxxiv 20. See the whole Psalm.

Let us hold fast the Profession of our faith without wavering ; for he is faithful that promised. Heb. x. 23.

F I N I S.



John S. ...
...

11/60
M/-

EARL

...



